

AMERICAN CATHOLIC
OPINION
IN THE
SLAVERY CONTROVERSY

BY
MADELEINE HOOKE RICE, M. A.

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN THE
FACULTY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

NEW YORK

1944



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

AMERICAN CATHOLIC
OPINION
IN THE
SLAVERY CONTROVERSY

BY
MADELEINE HOOKE RICE, M. A.

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN THE
FACULTY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

NUMBER 508

NEW YORK

1944

COPYRIGHT, 1944

BY

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA



To

MY HUSBAND

PREFACE

UNTIL very recently the history of the Roman Catholic community in this country has been treated mainly from the point of view of ecclesiastical development. Standard works like that of John Gilmary Shea, while useful in following the details of church organization, have paid little or no attention to the trend of Catholic thought and action in the field of social or economic relations. It has long been my belief that a series of studies of Catholic opinion on individual social problems would be helpful in filling this gap as well as in throwing light on more recent tendencies within the church membership. Because the slavery controversy took place during a very vital period in the history of the Catholic Church in the United States and because of the complexity of the issues involved, the question seems to afford a peculiarly favorable opportunity for such analysis.

There are certain difficulties in carrying out a study of this kind. In the first place, source materials such as newspapers, contemporary records, and the papers of individual laymen and priests, are scattered and frequently unavailable. Furthermore, much of the archival collections of the religious orders and of the secular dioceses is concerned with the more purely ecclesiastical problems. Consequently, an exhaustive search of these records, besides being beyond the scope of this study, seems unlikely to disclose sufficient pertinent data to justify the expenditure of time required for such an investigation.

I have attempted, therefore, after a preliminary study of the institution of slavery among Catholics, to make a sectional analysis of Catholic attitudes based upon representative opinion among the church members. The result constitutes, I think, a fairly comprehensive view of the Catholic approach to the slavery question.

The obligations incurred in the course of preparing the study are numerous. It has been my privilege to work under the

direction of Professor Henry Steele Commager of Columbia University. To Professor Commager I am deeply indebted for many helpful suggestions and for invaluable assistance in the task of literary revision. Professor Richard J. Purcell of the Catholic University of America has given generously of his time in discussing problems of preparation and in criticizing the manuscript. Professor Carlton J. H. Hayes of Columbia University has paused in the midst of heavy responsibilities to read the entire manuscript. I am indebted also to Professor Frank Tannenbaum of Columbia University for valuable advice.

An acknowledgment is due to those persons who have placed at my disposal the research facilities of their respective institutions. My obligation is especially great to the Reverend Arthur Reilly of St. John's Seminary, Brighton, Mass., to Sister Leona of the Sisters of Charity of Mount St. Joseph's, Ohio, to the Very Reverend Victor O'Daniel, O.P., of the Dominican House of Studies, Washington, D. C., and to Dr. Walter Wilkinson of the Riggs Memorial Library, Georgetown University.

Members of the staff of the library of Columbia University have been most cooperative. I am indebted to Miss Dorothy Hale Litchfield for assistance in locating elusive source material. Miss Marie Davis and my daughter, Alessandra Rice, have given faithful service in carrying through the details of publication.

MADELEINE HOOKE RICE.

NEW YORK,
NOVEMBER, 1943.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	7
CHAPTER I	
The Catholic Tradition	11
CHAPTER II	
Catholicism and Slavery in English America	25
CHAPTER III	
American Catholics and the Slave System	40
CHAPTER IV	
The Challenge of Immediacy	62
CHAPTER V	
The Case against Abolitionism	86
CHAPTER VI	
Sectional Divergence—The Church North	110
CHAPTER VII	
Sectional Divergence—The Church South	131
CHAPTER VIII	
Conclusion	152
BIBLIOGRAPHY	163
INDEX	173

CHAPTER I

THE CATHOLIC TRADITION

WHEN, early in the sixteenth century, African slavery was adopted as a system of labor in the New World the Catholic Church had a long established tradition on the subject of human bondage. An integral part of the economic organization of the Roman Empire at the dawn of Christianity, slavery continued as an accepted institution under the Christian order, and the Church through its agents held property in slaves.¹

The gospels of Christianity set forth an ideal of human nature which insisted upon the "essential and inherent equality of mankind" and the capacity of all men whether free or slave to know and to serve God.² This ideal the early Church Fathers reaffirmed in writings and practices which established the right of all to participate in the sacraments and liturgy of the church. In exhortations to masters and to slaves they recalled the reciprocal duties of each, kindness and brotherly love on the part of one, submission and faithfulness to duty on the part of the other.³

Principles which thus proclaimed the equality of the human race before God and the immortality of bond and free alike would seem at variance with a system which reduced human beings to the status of chattel property and virtually deprived them of human dignity and personality. Christian leaders were

1 Paul Allard, "Esclavage", *Dictionnaire Apologétique de la Foi Catholique*, V, 1469-1475; Paul-Louis, *Ancient Rome at Work*, 131-147; W. L. Westermann, "Ancient Slavery", *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, XIV, 74-77; "Sklaverei", Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, *Realencyclopädie Der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Supplementband, VI, 994-1067.

2 R. W. and A. J. Carlyle, *A History of Medieval Political Theory in the West*, I, III.

3 Allard, *op. cit.*, 1477-1485; Carlyle, *op. cit.*, I, 86-88, 111-112, 124; J. K. Ingram, *A History of Slavery and Serfdom*, 65-70, 82-83; F. A. MacNutt, *Bartholomew Las Casas*, xii-xiv; Mourret-Thompson, *History of the Catholic Church*, II, 417-418, 467-468, III, 105-106.

indeed agreed that in the original state of nature all men were free of the obligation of personal servitude but upon the existent institution of slavery they made no direct attack. Faced with the problem of explaining the continuance of a system admittedly opposed to the natural state of man, they attributed its existence to original sin. With man's lapse from innocence came the need for new disciplines to restrain and correct evil dispositions produced by the Fall, and to this end were instituted such agencies as government, private property, and slavery.⁴

Accepting slavery, then, as a consequence of original sin and not of itself sinful, the Fathers were concerned rather for the moral or spiritual equality of the slave than for his worldly status when they struck at certain evils associated with that status. It was with the former end in view that they gave their support to measures intended to protect the lives and persons of the bondmen, to insure the right to full religious privileges, to safeguard family relations and other prerogatives derived from the dignity of human nature, and to encourage manumission by individual owners as an act of charity.⁵ Such action involved no challenge to the legitimacy of the system itself, and when serfdom supplanted slavery as the prevailing system of labor in western Europe the change was due primarily to social and economic factors. If Christianity contributed to the decline of classical slavery it did so indirectly through the intangible influence of teachings favorable to the more humane treatment of the slave and encouraging to manumission.⁶

4 Winston Ashley, *The Theory of Natural Slavery According to Aristotle and St. Thomas*, 28-33; St. Augustine, *The City of God*, XIX, 15-16; Carlyle, *op. cit.*, I, 112-124; W. R. Brownlow, *Lectures on Slavery and Serfdom*, 52.

5 Allard, *op. cit.*, 1485-1495; John England, *Letters to the Hon. John Forsyth on the Subject of Domestic Slavery*, 48 ff.; Mourret-Thompson, *op. cit.*, III, 175-192, 276-280.

6 Carlyle, *op. cit.*, I, 124; Allard, *op. cit.*, 1475-1478; James Gibbons, *Our Christian Heritage*, 425; Leo XIII, *To the Bishops of Brazil on the Church and Slavery*, 7-9; E. C. Jonkers, "De L'Influence Du Christianisme Sur La Legislation Relative A L'Esclavage Dans L'Antiquité", *Mnemosyne Bibliotheca Classica Batava*, 3rd Ser. I, 241-280, Westermann, *op. cit.*, 1067.

The attitude of medieval churchmen to serfdom and to such vestiges of slavery as persisted during the Middle Ages was substantially the same as that of the earlier canonists. The exponents of Scholasticism placed greater emphasis upon the ideal of an ordered society with each individual occupying a fixed position and fulfilling the duties of that position but in other respects they were in agreement with their predecessors.⁷ Thomas Aquinas and his fellow Schoolmen upheld the teaching of the Church Fathers that the servile state derived from positive or civil law rather than from an innate incapacity for freedom on the part of the individuals held in subjection. Sharing the Augustinian view that slavery, non-existent in the primitive state of nature, was a fitting punishment for man once he had lost his original innocence through the sin of Adam, Thomas described the slave as differing from the free man :

in that the latter has the disposal of himself, as is stated in the beginning of the *Metaphysics* (of Aristotle), whereas a slave is ordered to another. So that a man rules over another when he refers the one whom he rules to his own—namely the ruler's—use. And since every man's own proper good is desirable to himself, and consequently it is a grievous matter to yield to another what ought to be one's own, therefore such dominion implies of necessity a pain inflicted on the subject; and in the state of innocence such a thing could not have existed between man and man.⁸

At the same time he sought to safeguard the natural prerogatives of the slave and of the serf, among which he included free participation in the Christian Church, protection of family rights, and the privilege of receiving Holy Orders.⁹ A student of the Thomistic system has summarized the position of Thomas and his colleague as follows :

⁷ Bede Jarrett, *Social Theories of the Middle Ages*, 94-105.

⁸ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Part I, Third Number, XCVI, a. 4; Ashley, *op. cit.*, 108-109, 113-114.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 123-128, Allard, *op. cit.*, 1496-1499; Carlyle, *op. cit.*, II, 117-135.

If slavery is an institution of the *jus gentium*, the slave remains truly human, possessed of the fundamental human rights, and slavery itself becomes an institution of relative value. St. Thomas, as we have seen did not adopt the Aristotelian idea of the slave as 'alterius' as a principle in deciding practical ethical problems. Concretely speaking he recognized only two forms of slavery as justified, first enslavement of the offenders in war, and second slavery as a traditional institution which could not be uprooted without upsetting the hard won social order of his times. He was not acquainted with the horrors of the later slave trade and slaving expeditions, but only with a traditional servitude to which no free man was reduced except voluntarily or in punishment for crime. These institutions had their place in the hierarchy of a society of Christians, and did not imply any spiritual division of men, except the one between Christians and non-Christians which the Church longed to remove by preaching His Gospel.¹⁰

Serfdom was thus accepted as a part of human conditions and a necessary agency for social progress.¹¹ For the serf, as for the slave, the position of the Church implied no change in social or economic status but was simply an assertion that for religious reasons both were entitled to certain fundamental rights.¹²

By the early fifteenth century serfdom likewise was on the decline and slavery was practically extinct in western Europe save in some sections of the Mediterranean world where conflict between Christians and Saracens had kept the institution alive, and in the Iberian peninsula where the wars against the Moors in Granada and northern Africa had long furnished a supply of captives. The mid-century, however, brought about a resurgence of slavery in a new and more commercialized form when, as a result of the Portuguese explorations along the west coast of

¹⁰ Ashley, *op. cit.*, 142.

¹¹ Jarrett, *op. cit.*, 99-100.

¹² Ashley, *op. cit.*, 23; *Cambridge Medieval History*, I, 592-593, 566-567.

Africa, a regular traffic in Negro slaves developed in Portugal and southern Spain.¹³

The fact that the discovery and colonization of the New World followed so closely upon the Portuguese contact with Africa gave a powerful stimulus to this trade. Colonists in the Spanish Indies were almost at once confronted with the problem of securing a labor supply adequate to develop the new possessions. The whole tragic story of the exploitation of the native Indians requires no repetition here. Suffice it to say that the Spanish Crown from motives of religion took steps to check Indian slavery on the grounds that enslavement of a native population by a conquering power was contrary to natural law and Christian ethics.¹⁴

Missionaries, who accompanied the *conquistadores* for the purpose of converting the Indians to Catholicism, took from the beginning an active part in efforts to protect them from abuse. In 1511 Antonio Montesinos, one of the friars attached to the Dominican convent in Santo Domingo, denounced the practices of the slave holders among his congregation in terms which left no doubt of his conviction that by their treatment of the natives they were forfeiting their chances of salvation.¹⁵ Montesinos was followed by that doughty champion of the Indians, Bartolomeo Las Casas, another Dominican monk, who was largely instrumental in securing a legal modification of the *encomienda* system under which the Indians were subjected to forced labor of various kinds.¹⁶

Efforts of the clergy and of the government to protect the natives were supplemented by papal pronouncements aimed at

13 J. R. Brackett, *The Negro in Maryland*, 2-4; U. B. Phillips, *American Negro Slavery*, 1-13; H. A. Wyndham, *The Atlantic and Slavery*, 220.

14 Sir Arthur Helps, *Spanish Conquest of America*, I, 181-185; Allard, *op. cit.*, 1512.

15 Thomas O'Gorman, *A History of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States*, 21.

16 MacNutt, *op. cit.*, *passim*. Sir Arthur Helps treats the career of Las Casas at length in his four volume history of the Spanish conquest.

preventing the reduction to bondage of free-born inhabitants and abolishing the traffic in Indians and in other free peoples, whether Christian or pagan. As early as 1482 Pope Pius II had denounced the Portuguese traders in Africa who were enslaving natives for commercial purposes.¹⁷ In the early sixteenth century differences of opinion between Dominicans and Franciscans in the Spanish islands as to the status and the moral prerogatives of the pagan Indians precipitated a controversy which was referred for settlement to the reigning pontiff, Leo X. Leo sustained the Dominican position with the declaration that "not only the Christian religion, but Nature herself cried out against a state of slavery".¹⁸ In 1537 Paul III made clear the opinion of the papacy in two separate encyclicals, one in support of the stand taken by Las Casas and the Dominicans, and the other a longer and more detailed exposition addressed to the faithful everywhere.¹⁹

The position of the crown and of ecclesiastical authorities as protectors of the Indian population was thus established by royal decree and papal bull. Missionaries lent their support to efforts to apply this policy but resistance on the part of the *encomenderos* frequently hampered enforcement of such protective measures. The attitude of the average colonist to the native worker was conditioned more by the character, experience, ability, and economic interest of the individual than by religious or spiritual motives.

The policy of the government in forbidding the enslavement of Indians and the rapid decline of the native population owing to forced labor, privations suffered under the *encomienda* system, and new diseases acquired from the Europeans, forced the Spanish settlers to look elsewhere for their labor. In the homeland they were already familiar with Negro slaves, some of whom had been brought out from Spain as early as 1501, and Ovando, the second governor of Santo Domingo had among

17 Brownlow, *op. cit.*, 83; Augustin Cochin, *The Results of Slavery*, 352.

18 Ludwig Pastor, *History of the Papacy*, VIII, 447.

19 Brownlow, *op. cit.*, 84; MacNutt, *op. cit.*, 407-431.

his instructions permission to import Christian Negroes from the mother country.²⁰ The traffic really began, however, in 1517 when Charles V responded to the pleas of his colonial subjects for more laborers by granting to a group of Flemish favorites a license for the importation of slaves to the Indies, thus beginning the *asiento* system under which the Spanish dominions received their supplies of slaves for the next three centuries.²¹ Successive grants increased the number permitted annually as the colonists demanded more and yet more Africans to meet their ever increasing needs for workers on the plantations and in the mines.²²

Almost from the beginning there existed side by side with the legal importations an illegal traffic which one authority has estimated as reaching such proportions by 1552 that for every 100 slaves brought in openly as many as 200 were introduced secretly.²³ Smuggling continued with increasing success throughout the colonial regime, frequently with the connivance of royal officials who supported the planters in their conviction that the needs of the economic system required an unlimited supply of slaves. This trade, both licit and illicit, remained largely in the hands of foreigners since the lack of stations on the African coast and the development of the *asiento* system combined with religious influences and conditions within Spain to discourage Spaniards from taking part in it.²⁴

The story of the rise of Negro slavery in the New World possessions of the other Catholic colonizing powers was much the same. In both the French West Indies and Portuguese Brazil efforts to place the Indian population under some kind of forced labor followed upon the conquest. In the case of France, Louis

20 Wm. Robertson, *The History of the Discovery and Settlement of America*, 113-114.

21 Helps, *op. cit.*, II, 10-11.

22 *Ibid.*, III, 148-149.

23 *Ibid.*, 151-152.

24 H. H. Aimes, *Slavery in Cuba*, 171-173, 21.

XII abrogated an old French law providing that all who reached the realm of the king of France became at once free, on the ostensible grounds that slavery was the only way of converting savages to the Christian faith, but Indian slavery in the French islands as elsewhere proved unsatisfactory.²⁵ In 1739 the king, adopting the stand taken at an earlier date by the Spanish sovereign, forbade further enslaving of Indians and freed those already in servitude. As in the Spanish colonies the law was sometimes disregarded but on the whole the number of such slaves was small.²⁶

The first Negroes to enter the French colonies were brought to the island of St. Christophe in the 1620's by a privateersman who had captured them from a Spanish vessel. In 1633 the traffic was legalized by the government with the grant of a charter to a group of French merchants who were given exclusive trading privileges along the African coast. The expansion of the sugar industry during the latter part of the century greatly increased the demand for slaves which in turn gave a stimulus to the activity of the trading companies in Africa.²⁷

Indian slavery progressed further in Brazil where the Portuguese government was slower to take steps for the protection of the natives. Portuguese colonists, buttressing their economic needs with the convenient argument that it was quite right to force Indians to work for Christians in return for the blessing of faith, were likewise more persistent in opposing and outwitting such protection.²⁸ However, in Brazil also, the

25 N. M. Crouse, *French Pioneers in the West Indies*, 40.

26 Lucien Peytraud, *L'Esclavage aux Antilles Françaises avant 1789*, 26-32.

27 *Ibid.*, 36-142. For various aspects of French slavery see also Pierre de Vaissière, *Saint Domingue*; Maurice Satineau, *Histoire de la Guadeloupe sous l'Ancien Regime*; Baron de Wimpffen, *Voyage à Saint Dominique, pendant les Années, 1788, 1789, 1790*. J. B. Labat, *Voyages aux Isles de l'Amérique (Antilles) 1693-1705* has much enlightening first-hand information on phases of the slavery problem economic as well as religious.

28 Robert Southey, *History of Brazil*, II, 453-455, 637-638.

decline of the native population and restrictions imposed by Church and Crown combined with the availability to the Portuguese of an unlimited supply of Negro workers from their African possessions to encourage the development of Negro slavery as the favored method of supplying the labor necessary for the exploitation of the agricultural and mineral wealth of the country.²⁹

The position which the Catholic Church assumed as protector of the Indians meant that in the French and Portuguese colonies, as in the Spanish, measures taken by the Crown in their behalf received the support of the clergy, especially of the religious orders, who proved on the whole more effective missionaries than the secular priests. The activity of the Spanish *Las Casas* had its counterpart in the work of French and Portuguese missionaries. Among the latter a Jesuit father, Antonio Vieyera, was indefatigable in his labors to counteract a religious laxity among the colonists which encouraged gross mistreatment of the natives and countenanced a scandalous trade in captive Indians.³⁰

The attitude of these three powers to Negro slavery was subject to a common influence in that the Catholic Church was the established faith for each. In the case of Spain and Portugal the experience which they had had with African slavery in Europe made easier the task of fitting the slaves into the social and legal system of the colonies—a fact which worked for an even closer similarity in the slave systems of those two countries.

In the early years of colonization ecclesiastical authorities gave a certain encouragement to the use of Negro slaves.

29 Wyndham, *op. cit.*, 249-250; Southey, *op. cit.*, III, 511-512. In 1741 Pope Benedict XIV took cognizance of this fact in a bull directed to the faithful in Brazil in which he prohibited the "buying, selling, or giving or receiving the natives in slavery, separating them from their families, depriving them of their goods or in anyway infringing upon their freedom." Cochin, *op. cit.*, 407-410.

30 Labat, *op. cit.*, *passim*. Southey, *op. cit.*, II, 456.

Concern for the Indian, eagerness for the proselytes among the pagan Africans, and failure to realize the full extent of the evils attendant upon the African trade persuaded some clerics to adopt an attitude which they came later to regret.³¹ Furthermore, in the case of the Indians it was obvious from the nature of the conquest that, contrary to long established Christian custom, free men were being reduced to bondage. The Africans, on the other hand were, according to popular belief, already enslaved in their homeland, and the transfer to America involved merely an exchange of owners with the added advantage of a Christian environment which was denied them in Africa.³²

As the true nature of the slave trade became evident the official voice of the Catholic Church was raised against it. In 1639 Pope Urban VIII condemned the traffic and forbade Catholics to take part in it.³³ Violations of the papal decree by individual traders of the Catholic nations under pressure of economic exigency, and the failure of Catholic rulers to implement the ruling of the Church with the power of the civil law induced successive popes to repeat this prohibition.³⁴ Note-

31 Helps, *op. cit.*, IV, 300; Wyndham, *op. cit.*, 232-233. Las Casas in his long struggle for the Indian emphasized more and more the evils inherent in all slavery. In his *Historia General* he expressed his regret at the part he may have played in encouraging Negro slavery through zeal for the Indian. MacNutt, *op. cit.*, 278-293, 105-106. Charles V. showed a similar change when, after having permitted the establishment of the slave trade on a regular basis, he ordered all slaves in his American possessions freed. This action coincided with the promulgation in 1542 of his new code of laws for the Indians. Some manumissions actually took place but the law was deprived of effectiveness by his retirement to the monastery. Thomas Clarkson, *Abolition of the Slave Trade*, 34-35.

32 Helps, *op. cit.*, IV, 255-256.

33 Aimes, *op. cit.*, 17.

34 Pius VIII in 1815, Gregory XVI in 1839, Pius IX in 1850, Leo XIII in 1888 and 1890. M. F. Rouse, *A Study of the Development of Negro Education under Catholic Auspices in Maryland and the District of Columbia*, 27; Allard, *op. cit.*, 1519-1520, Leo XIII, *op. cit.*, 12-13.

worthy among these expressions of papal opinion was the Apostolic Letter of Gregory XVI, issued in 1839 when the Christian nations of the western world were cooperating for the elimination of the African trade.³⁵

Towards the existent system of Negro slavery the Church officially maintained its traditional attitude of 1) alleviating the hardships connected with it, 2) protecting the integrity of family life and safeguarding the natural rights of the slave, 3) insisting upon religious equality and sufficient instruction to insure an understanding of the fundamental truths of religion, 4) encouraging manumission. There was all too often a lag between the ideal and its practical application and the record of missionary labor abounds in expressions of regret and discouragement over the failure of slave owners to apply the teachings of the Church to the management of their slaves. Indeed a frequent source of conflict between clergy and planters throughout the colonial period lay in the insistence by the former that the slaves receive adequate religious instruction and participate freely in the religious life of the community.³⁶

Needless to say there were instances of failure on the part of the clergy, usually seculars, to give their full support to the policy of the Church. The conditions under which they worked in the colonies, often cut off from proper supervision, and exposed to a variety of temptations made difficult the problem of discipline which was complicated further by the fact that the secular priests who went to the colonies were often those who had been guilty of some irregularity or non-obedience to authority at home.³⁷

Within the religious orders the discipline imposed by their organization encouraged among the members a more zealous

³⁵ England, *op. cit.*, ix-xi.

³⁶ Labat, *op. cit.*; Southey, *op. cit.*, *passim*; M. W. Williams, "The Treatment of Negro Slaves in the Brazilian Empire," *Journal of Negro History*, XV, 330-331; C. G. Woodson, *History of the Negro Church*, 1-4.

³⁷ Cochin, *op. cit.*, 172; Allard, *op. cit.*, 1514; de Wimpffen, *op. cit.*, II, 92.

performance of duty. It was not uncommon for them to act as protectors for the slave population against mistreatment and other misfortunes arising from the slave status. The religious were themselves slave owners since under the colonial system they were partially dependent for support upon the products of their own estates which, for lack of any other form of labor, they cultivated through the use of Negro slaves. Slavery as it existed on these holdings was paternalistic in character but it seems to have had advantages sometimes lacking on other plantations. As a rule the slaves were seldom sold, and then usually in family units. Manumissions were fairly common and the activity carried on was less commercial in character.³⁸

Among the slave holders of the Latin colonies, as in any other economy where slavery existed, the actual treatment of the slaves varied considerably, depending upon the character, training, and economic interest of the owner, the ability and efficiency with which he managed his properties, the force of public opinion, and the degree of regulation by governmental authority. Treatment was likely to be more harsh in isolated communities, on large plantations where the management was entrusted to an overseer with the master absent a good part of the time, and in regions where a preponderance of blacks aroused a feeling of insecurity among the white population. Custom and legislation in the Spanish and Portuguese colonies and the Code Noir of the French regime gave governmental sanction to the requirements of the Church for religious instruction of the slaves and granted certain specified privileges such as freedom from work on Sundays and holydays, and the enjoyment of at least a minimum standard of food and clothing. These statutes provided also for a rigid system of control and

³⁸ Southey, *op. cit.*, III, 780-785; Labat, *op. cit.*, *passim*; Williams, *op. cit.*, 332. Lunn, *op. cit.*, for a biography of one of the most famous missionaries to the slaves, and for a discussion of the attitude of the Catholic Church towards slavery. The author gives special emphasis to the ideal of spiritual service to the bondmen as exemplified in the life of the saint of Cartagena.

discipline which was, however, probably less severe in application than in the law.³⁹

The existence of the runaway problem, occasional violence, and sporadic servile uprisings attest to the fact that neither governmental protection nor ecclesiastical censure could make of the system an institution which in any way approached the ideal.⁴⁰ At the same time the position of the slave in the colonies of the Catholic powers seems on the whole to have been less unhappy and less hopeless than elsewhere. Especially was this true of the Spanish and Portuguese regimes where the force of an established slave custom furnished an ameliorative influence lacking in the French empire.

In all three, law and habit as well as religious motives made the process of manumission easier. In the Spanish colonies, for example, the slave had the legal right of self purchase at a set price.⁴¹ Similarly, the method laid down in the Code Noir was simple and readily carried out, although late in the colonial period French policy in this respect was modified somewhat when the rapid increase in the number of freedmen gave rise to a fear that they might disturb the stability of colonial government and incite in the slaves a desire for freedom.⁴² In Brazil there were a number of special conditions aside from self-purchase or action by the owner which encouraged manumission. Thus, freedom might be given to a faithful nurse, to an infant at the time of baptism, or to the mother of a large family.⁴³

39 Helps, *op. cit.*, IV, 250-252, 268; Cochin, *op. cit.*, 163; M. W. Williams, "Modern Slavery-General", *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, XIV, 80-84; Wyndham, *op. cit.*, 242-247. For Brazilian codes see Wyndham, *op. cit.*, 252-253; Williams, "Treatment of Negro Slaves", *op. cit.*, 324-326, 330-335; Donald Pierson, *Negroes in Brazil*, 46. The French code is printed in M. A. Dessalles, *Histoire Générale des Antilles*, II, 458-471.

40 Williams, *op. cit.*, 327-328; Helps, *op. cit.*, IV, 250; Cochin, *op. cit.*, 171; Peytraud, *op. cit.*, 342-372.

41 Aimes, *op. cit.*, 229; W. L. Mathieson, *British Slavery and its Abolition*, 33-38.

42 Peytraud, *op. cit.*, 401-420.

43 Williams, *op. cit.*, 332-333.

Due partly to tradition and partly to religious influence there was less racial discrimination than in Anglo-America, for example, a fact which tended to facilitate the liberation of individual slaves and to make more favorable the position of the freedman.⁴⁴ Furthermore the Catholic Church, having made of the Negro an object of salvation, assumed with varying success the task of protecting his religious and moral rights. Slave children were instructed and received into full membership in the Church, the regular reception of the sacraments was required of blacks as of the white population; slaves and freedmen frequently had their own religious societies; when they died they were buried in consecrated ground. The numerous religious holidays, observance of which was guaranteed to them by ecclesiastical and civil fiat, not only gave some relief from the daily drudgery of their lives but afforded an opportunity for accumulating money towards the purchase of freedom. Finally there was the intangible but potentially powerful influence of the religious concept of the unity of the slave with the free man as children of a common Father.

⁴⁴ Williams, *op. cit.*, 335.

CHAPTER II

CATHOLICISM AND SLAVERY IN ENGLISH AMERICA

IN the colonies of the Catholic powers the official theory of the Catholic Church in regard to the relationships involved in the institution of slavery was incorporated in the legal code, while the prestige resultant from the position of that church as the established state religion served to enhance the force of its moral influence. In English America Catholicism was subject to a different influence. Legislation regulating the slave system in these colonies naturally did not include provisions like those in the Latin codes in which the sovereigns had insisted by royal decree on the participation of the Africans in the sacramental system of the Catholic Church. Absent also were statutes similar to those which had laid down the obligations to be fulfilled in this connection by the slave owner.¹

As a matter of fact, for some time after the introduction of Negro slavery into the English plantations public sentiment toward the conversion of the slaves differed from that in the Catholic countries. According to an ancient English law a slave who had been baptized became free.² There was in consequence a tendency among the planters to oppose baptism which might perforce necessitate manumission. Provincial statutes and a ruling from the bishop of London, in accord

¹ For a survey of English slave laws see U. B. Phillips, *American Negro Slavery*, 489-499. Phillips points out the influence upon English legislation of the self-governing features of the English colonial system. Such laws, because they were enacted by local legislative bodies rather than by fiat of a despotic home government, reflected the anxiety of the colonials for their own personal safety. *Ibid.*, 495-496.

² H. T. Catterall, *Judicial Cases Concerning American Slavery and the Negro*, I, 55. This law was apparently in force in Virginia in 1612 for in that year one "John Phillip, A Negro" qualified to testify in the General Court because he had been "Christened in England 12 years since". Re Tutchinge, Minutes of the Council, ed. McIlwain, 33. November 1624. *Ibid.*, 76; also *ibid.*, 55, n. 14.

with his jurisdiction over the Anglican Church in the colonies, eventually established the principle that the baptism of a slave in no way implied his release from bondage but the earlier belief served for some time as a deterrent to missionary activity among the slaves.³

Moreover, in most of the English colonies Catholicism was proscribed or subject to penal restrictions which made it a negligible force in colonial life. Except in Maryland the number of practicing Catholics was few, and even in the proprietary grant of the Catholic Calverts they were outnumbered by Protestant settlers and deprived of any deciding voice in the conduct of affairs.⁴ In view of these circumstances and also because the proprietor's religion necessitated the exercise of the utmost circumspection in policy and management, it is not surprising that the period of Catholic rule should have left little lasting effect upon the institutional development of the colony.⁵

Maryland, however, was early among the provinces which took legislative action to encourage the baptism of slaves. The Assembly adopted such a provision in 1671, and some years later Lord Baltimore, in discussing the conversion of Negroes in the various colonies, attributed to the passage of this law the contrast which he believed to exist between the attitude of Maryland planters and that of slaveholders elsewhere, who refused "(out of coveteousness) to permit their negroes and

3 H. A. Wyndham, *The Atlantic and Slavery*, 235-237; C. G. Woodson, *The Education of the Negro Prior to 1861*, 3-4. An act enacted in 1667 by the Virginia assembly ran as follows:

Whereas some doubts have arisen whether children that are slaves by birth, and by the charity and piety of their owners made pertakers of the blessed sacrament of baptisme, should by the vertue of their baptisme be made free; It is enacted... that the conferring of baptisme doth not alter the condition of the person as to his bondage or freedome; that diverse masters freed from this doubt, may more carefully endeavor the propagation of christianity by permitting children, though slaves, or those of greater growth if capable, to be admitted to that sacrament. Quoted in Catterall, *op. cit.*, I, 57; C. G. Woodson, *History of the Negro Church*, 6.

4 J. G. Shea, *History of the Catholic Church in the U. S.*, III, 264; J. T. Gillard, *Colored Catholics in the U. S.*, 47-48.

5 Phillips, *op. cit.*, 78.

mulattoes to be baptized, out of an opinion that baptism is a manumission of their services".⁶

In the absence of an established hierarchy in the province, the Jesuit Fathers directed the religious life of the Catholic settlers. For the support of their missionary activity and the satisfaction of their own needs the Fathers depended upon the cultivation of agricultural properties.⁷ Here, as in other parts of the colonial world, they accepted the prevailing system of labor and employed Negro slaves to work their farms and perform other necessary duties.⁸

On their own manors it was a simple enough matter for the Jesuits to secure to these "servants" the enjoyment of religious privileges and such instruction as seemed desirable but the task was more difficult when they turned to the slaves elsewhere.⁹ In the Spanish, French, and Portuguese colonies where royal edict reinforced the decrees of the Church, lay opposition often made measures intended to facilitate the conversion of the Africans and to make certain their participation in the sacramental system difficult to enforce. There was a similar disposition among some planters in Maryland who feared that such a course might have an unsettling effect upon the slaves

6 Thomas Hughes, *History of the Society of Jesus in North America*, Text, II, 116; J. R. Brackett, *The Negro in Maryland*, 29.

7 Under the Conditions of Plantation the Jesuits secured grants on the same basis as other gentlemen adventurers. By the first grants they got 8,000 acres and additions were made during later years through purchase or gift. In 1756 the 8,000 Catholics in Maryland owned 316,155 acres of land of which about 31,615 acres belonged to the Jesuits. Peter Guilday, "The Priesthood of Colonial Maryland", *Ecclesiastical Review*, Jan. 1934, 20, 25.

8 In 1765 there were 192 slaves distributed among 7 manors. Of these approximately 101 were working hands. See the report of Father Hunter to the Provincial, Father Dennett. Hughes, *op. cit.*, Doc. I, Part I, 335-337.

9 C. G. Woodson, *The Education of the Negro Prior to 1861*, 107-108. The Jesuits usually referred to their Negroes as "servants", "laborers", "the family". In most of the contemporary documents studied members of the clergy avoided the use of the term "slave".

and possibly jeopardize the security of valuable property. As a result, and in order to avoid a conflict which might end their usefulness completely, the Fathers were obliged to exercise considerable tact in their dealings with masters and slaves.¹⁰

In conformity with the tradition of their faith, they made no direct attack upon the institution itself but confined their efforts to ministering to the spiritual needs of the slaves, encouraging them in the faithful performance of the duties associated with the servile state, and impressing upon the white members of the congregations a sense of the responsibilities resulting from the possession of arbitrary powers over fellow human beings. Notes made in the course of a spiritual retreat by one of the Jesuits, George Hunter, throw light upon the attitude of the Maryland clergy in their work among the free and slave members of their flock:

Charity to negroes is due from all particularly their masters. As they are members of Jesus Christ, redeemed by his precious blood, they are to be dealt with in a charitable, Christian paternal manner; which is at the same time a great means to bring them to do their duty to God, and therefore to gain their souls.¹¹

Some years later Brother Joseph Mobberly, who supervised the management of several of the Jesuit farms, drew upon the practical experience, thus acquired, to point out the obligations

¹⁰ An example of such difficulties may be found in a letter from Father John Souge to Archbishop Carroll, March 1801, in which Souge reported the hostility prevalent among his parishioners as a result of false charges circulated among them. He was accused of being "entièrement contre l'esclavage", of arousing the Negroes against their masters, and of inciting rebellion against the whites. Another criticism was that he had taught certain slaves to sing without the consent of their masters. Father Souge was successful in disproving the charges but in the belief that they had interfered with his usefulness in that community his superior transferred him to another parish. 7TI Cathedral Archives, Baltimore, Maryland; M. F. Rouse, *A Study of the Development of Negro Education under Catholic Auspices in Maryland and the District of Columbia*, 27-28.

¹¹ Hughes, *op. cit.*, Text II, 559.

incumbent upon those owners who hoped to merit salvation. "Masters must answer," he declared:

1. For exposing the lives of their slaves by not providing them with beds and comfortable houses.
2. Permitting whole families of children without regard to sex, to sleep in the same bed by which means they become corrupted in their tender years.
3. Not providing them with necessary food and raiment, and thus refusing to pay their labourers their wages—a sin crying to heaven for vengeance.
4. Not permitting them to marry.
5. Not instructing them in their christian duty, so as to prepare them *properly* for the Sacraments.
6. Not compelling them by proper means to perform their christian duties.
7. Not restraining them in their evil courses, and not caring to chastise them for their immoral conduct.
8. Using cruel methods in correcting them.
9. Selling them under grievous circumstances and separating man and wife.

How many masters will infallibly be lost for the commission of the above crimes? In this life they are impoverished by keeping slaves: their lives are filled with cares and vexations: their prospects of happiness are marred and when they die, they lose all forever! Who then would possess a slave? ¹²

Throughout the colonial period restrictive legislation and popular antipathy to Catholicism limited missionary activity among the slaves. In Maryland such prejudice sometimes took the form of charges linking "Papists" with the slaves as a threat to the security of the colony, a fact which did not incline the Protestant owner to encourage contact between his slaves and the black-robed emissaries of Rome.¹³ As a result their work was confined largely to those Negroes belonging to Catholic masters.

¹² Joseph Mobberly, *Diary*. Ms. at Georgetown University, 142-143.

¹³ Gillard, *op. cit.*, 40-48; Brackett, *op. cit.*, 91-92.

Various other factors tended to increase the difficulty confronting the Maryland clergy. At the close of the Revolution, when John Carroll sent to the office of Propaganda in Rome his report on the condition of the American church, there were in Maryland only 19 priests to serve over 19,000 Catholics, of whom about 3,000 were slaves. Of conditions among the laity, Father Carroll wrote that the majority performed their duties but lacked "that fervor which frequent appeals to the sentiment of piety produce, as many congregations hear the word of God only once a month, and sometimes only once in two months. We are reduced to this by want of priests, by the distance of congregations from each other and by difficulty of travelling". Enumerating the various failings of Catholic worship, he noted a "general lack of care" in instructing the slaves in their religion, declaring further that "these people are kept constantly at work, so that they rarely hear any instruction from the priest unless they spend a short time with one; and most of them are consequently very dull in faith and depraved in morals. It can scarcely be believed how much trouble and care they give the pastors of souls."¹⁴

When it comes to the question of how the Catholic planters managed their slaves, whether they differed from their Protestant neighbors in any important particulars, whether they made kinder or more considerate masters, lack of documentary evidence upon which to reconstruct the institutional life of Catholics in the colonial period makes it difficult to find a satisfactory answer. In the opinion of competent students the lot of the slave, in so far as his physical comfort was concerned, tended to improve throughout English America during the colonial era.¹⁵ It is true also that, in general, good treatment of slaves rested on humane considerations, the economic interest of the master, force of public opinion, and more settled conditions, while harsh treatment was more apt to occur in

¹⁴ Peter Guilday, *The Life and Times of John Carroll*, I, 225-227.

¹⁵ Brackett, *op. cit.*, I, n. 1; L. C. Gray, *History of Agriculture in the Southern United States to 1860*, I, 519.

isolated places, in regions where the preponderance of blacks made for a feeling of insecurity, or on the plantations of absentee owners.¹⁶

In view of these considerations one may assume that the material condition of slaves held by Catholics in provincial Maryland probably resembled that of those owned by Protestant planters of similar type and experience. From the practice on the Jesuit farms, from statements like the one just quoted from Brother Mobberly's diary, as well as from the historical attitude of the Church on this subject, it is possible to infer something of the general principles which the Maryland clergy enunciated in the pulpit and the confessional. The effectiveness of such admonitions and the extent to which the fact of adherence to the Catholic religion might influence the slave owner, would be conditioned to a considerable extent by the character of the individual master, the sincerity of his religious convictions, and the way in which he applied these principles in his daily life.

The acquisition in 1803 of the Louisiana territory brought a considerable increase in the number of Catholic slaveholders in the United States. Negro slavery had been an established institution in Louisiana since 1617 when the charter granted by the French crown to John Law's Company of the West provided for the importation of slaves from Africa. The number increased gradually during the ensuing years in response to the expanding needs of the colonists but the real impetus came at the end of the 18th century with the beginning of sugar cultivation on a profitable basis.¹⁷

Under both French and Spanish régimes in the Mississippi Valley practically all masters and slaves belonged to the Catholic Church and relations between the two were subject to regulation by church authorities. In keeping with the theory of Church-State relationship adopted by contemporary Catholic powers, the government lent its support to these regulations,

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 517-519.

¹⁷ V. A. Moody, *Slavery on Louisiana Sugar Plantations*, 17-18.

which were intended to insure to the Negro certain basic rights, including the right to practice his religion freely, to keep unbroken his family relations, and to receive the protection of the civil law against excessive cruelty on the part of the master, or failure of the latter to provide him with the necessities of life. In 1724 the French governor, Bienville, promulgated for the colony a Code Noir similar to that in effect in the Caribbean islands.

Like its predecessor the Louisiana Code was rigid in its provisions for policing the slave population and punishing any infractions of the servile law but at the same time it imposed certain obligations upon the master and some limitations upon his arbitrary control over his human property.¹⁸ According to its terms, all slaves were to be baptized into the Catholic Church, they were to be free from work on Sundays and religious holidays, burial was to be in consecrated ground only. The owner's consent was necessary for marriage but once the religious ceremony was performed it was legally binding. Husbands and wives were not to be sold separately nor were children under fourteen to be taken from their parents. Masters were obliged to provide a certain minimum of food and clothing and to care for superannuated or disabled slaves. Neglect of these obligations or excessive cruelty on the part of the owner made him subject to legal action, and confiscation of the abused slave if convicted. Any master over twenty-five had the right of manumission upon receiving the approval of the Superior Council. Slaves so freed were warned to show respect to the former owner but they were guaranteed in other respects "the same rights, privileges and immunities which are enjoyed by free-born persons".

This code was, in the main, in effect under both French and Spanish rule. Similar provisions were included in the Carondelet Code of 1792, enacted by the Spanish governor

¹⁸ The Code Noir is printed in B. F. French, *Historical Collections of Louisiana*, III, 89-95; Charles Gayarré, *History of Louisiana*, I, 531-540.

after considerable controversy between the colonial planters and the government officials.¹⁹ In fact, colonial hostility had induced the crown to modify a royal schedule of May 31, 1789, on the grounds that certain of its requirements, such as one providing for a resident chaplain on each plantation were, from reasons of expense or expediency, impossible to fulfill.²⁰

During the colonial period, the direction of the spiritual life of the colonists in Louisiana was exercised chiefly by Capuchins and Jesuits, with the assistance in various capacities of the Ursuline nuns. All three of these orders used slaves for household servants and, in the case of the Capuchins and Jesuits, as laborers on the plantations from which they derived their chief support.²¹ Besides ministering to the needs of their own slaves the priests assumed the responsibility of instructing, baptizing, and marrying those owned by the colonists, while the nuns gave valuable service in supplementing the teaching efforts of the inadequate number of clergy among the women and children.²² Records show that the religious sometimes took upon themselves the task of protecting unfortunate bondsmen whose legal rights had been infringed upon, or of encouraging emancipation of individual slaves as a reward for some instance of exceptional ability or fidelity to duty.²³

19 For the Carondelet Code see A. Fortier, *A History of Louisiana*, II, 150.

20 Gayarré, *op. cit.*, III, 301-305; Fortier, *op. cit.*, II, 144-145.

21 Roger Baudier, *The Catholic Church in Louisiana*, 131-132, 164; Moody, *op. cit.*, 90.

22 Quotations from registries of baptism in Baudier, *op. cit.*, 127-128. For the Ursulines see *Jesuit Relations*, XLVIII, 201; Baudier, *op. cit.*, 183; Moody, *op. cit.*, 90. For the Jesuits see Baudier, *op. cit.*, 160; *Jesuit Relations*, LXX, 233, 265, LXIX, 31. For Capuchins see Baudier, *op. cit.*, 76-77, 131-132; C. L. Vogel, *The Capuchins in French Louisiana*, *passim*.

23 Baudier, *op. cit.*, 190, 213. See Catterall, *op. cit.*, III, 412 for a suit by P. Mathias, Curé of New Orleans against M. de Lapommeray, Treasurer-General, for burying a slave outside consecrated ground. M. de Lapommeray was ordered to have the body removed to a cemetery, he was fined 30 livres, and warned to avoid such infractions of the Code Noir in the future. Vicar-General v. Treasurer-General, 3 La. Hist. Q. 292, June 4, 1738.

The influence of Catholic tradition in Louisiana meant that, officially, both secular and spiritual authorities were insistent upon Christian training for the slaves as for freemen. Reports of the missionary Capuchins, which so often contained complaints of failure on the part of the slave owners to fulfill their responsibilities, paid tribute, on the other hand, from time to time, to the zeal of the more devout planters, who welcomed the priest when he arrived to instruct the bondsmen, saw to it that these were baptized and properly married, and sought in various ways to alleviate the hardships of their lot.²⁴

Throughout the colonial era, however, the religious and moral development of the greater part of the slave population was slow and hampered by a variety of factors. The character of the settlers, many of whom were drawn from the more disorderly elements of society in the homeland, the demoralizing influence of a raw colonial atmosphere, the lack of a sufficient number of priests to cope with these problems, all contributed to a general laxity of morals and religion, especially in the section outside New Orleans where difficulties of travel between the isolated settlements constituted a further handicap for the clergy.

Letters of the Capuchins to their superiors in France painted a dark picture of the spiritual life of both white and colored. According to these complaints, too many slaves died without being baptized, the performance of the religious ceremony of marriage was frequently neglected, and the Negroes were constantly subjected to numerous other violations of their personal rights.²⁵ No less serious in the eyes of the churchmen was the habit among many masters of marrying Christian slaves to those who were unbaptized.²⁶

One of the early missionaries, Father Raphael, writing in 1726, thus described the situation in his diocese:

²⁴ Baudier, *op. cit.*, 99.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 75; Vogel, *op. cit.*, 102-111.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 110-111.

There are always disorders among our French people which I cannot stop effectively without the help of the secular arm, but the present state of affairs does not give much hope from that side. The greatest scandals are caused by the officers who are too openly supported, so that I cannot flatter myself in being able to recall them to their duty . . .

I believe that such disorders would be less common if exemplary punishments would be administered. It would, moreover, be desirable for the good of religion if the prescriptions of the Black Code against masters who abuse their slaves and make them work on Sundays and Feastdays, would be put into execution, for although the number of those who keep Indian and Negro girls for immoral purposes has considerably decreased, there are still enough to scandalize the Church and to need an efficient remedy. Profanation of Sundays and Feast days is counted almost for nothing, especially in the places where there are no priests. Going up the river I have decided to go from farm to farm to have them make their Easter duty. I shall do the same going from New Orleans up to the Natchez when I shall have an opportunity. I hope after that to know how the people live in the country and what means have been used to remedy the disorders.²⁷

Conditions evidently did not improve under the Spanish régime for Bishop Penalver y Cardenas in a report to the Crown upon the religious state of his diocese gave much the same description. Deploring the prevalent religious and moral laxity, he wrote of the slaves that "universal custom, admitting of very rare exceptions, prevents (them) from entering the marriage state."²⁸ Shortcomings on the part of the laity were increased by similar laxity among some of the clergy who, because of personal weakness, distance from their superiors, or dispensations from the accustomed rigor of their rules to

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 105-106; see also his letter to Abbé Raguet protesting against immorality and irreligion on the part of the commandant of Natchez, Dec. 28, 1726. *Ibid.*, 107.

²⁸ Shea, *op. cit.*, II, 573; Baudier, *op. cit.*, 229-230.

meet the conditions of colonial life, came to neglect the performance of their sacerdotal duties.²⁹

Successive transfers of the colony from France to Spain, to France again, and finally to the United States, contributed to a further demoralization of Catholic life in Louisiana. The withdrawal of the Spanish bishop in 1801, when Louisiana was returned to French rule, kept the province without a responsible religious superior for some years.³⁰ In the absence of ecclesiastical authority, certain of the clergy became increasingly lax in the performance of their duties, schism developed in New Orleans, and conditions throughout lower Louisiana came to such a pass that when Bishop William Du Bourg arrived in 1815 to take up his see under the American régime, he established his residence in the upper part of the state and did not even visit New Orleans until several years later.³¹

The effect of all this upon the slave population has been pictured by a missionary who went into the Mississippi Valley after the American occupancy. In a letter to the director of the seminary in Lyons, France, where he had studied for the priesthood, John Odin wrote as follows:

The slavery of the negroes is most disheartening. American masters permit them to marry in church and to practice their religion. But in Lower Louisiana, the French for the most part, do not wish you to speak of instructing their slaves or of giving them the Sacrament of matrimony; they are often

29 *Ibid.*, 205-206. Perrin du Lac, *Travels through the two Louisianas*, 94; Robin, *Voyages*, II, 122-124; Berquin-Duvallon, *Vue de la Col. Esp.*, 172-175. All quoted in J. A. Robertson, *Louisiana under the Rule of Spain, France and the United States*, I, 209-211.

30 Shea, *op. cit.*, III, 360. The disintegration of Catholic life in Louisiana and the Floridas under the influence of the declining power of Spain is described in a recent study by M. J. Curley, *Church and State in the Spanish Floridas (1763-1822)*. Like other phases of religious life, regulations respecting the slaves were difficult to enforce and often ignored. *Ibid.*, 337.

31 Shea, *op. cit.*, III, 363-372; M. J. Spalding, *Sketches of the Life, Times, and Character of the Rt. Rev. Benedict Joseph Flaget*, 160-169.

not even permitted to go to Church. You can easily imagine how many irregularities result from this. How discouraged I was by it all in the beginning. Fortunately in Upper Louisiana we have but few slaves, and these lead good Christian lives.³²

Disregard of the marriage regulations to which Father Odin alluded was common among the French slaveholders of the territory, a fact which is borne out by the discrepancy between the number of slave marriages and the number of baptisms recorded in the Church registries.³³ It is apparent that however true may be the contention of competent authorities that the physical care and treatment of the slaves in the latter years of the Latin régime was on the whole more humane than in the English colonies at the same stage of development, the provisions made for their spiritual needs left much to be desired.³⁴

In one respect Catholic-Latin custom continued to make itself felt after the transfer of the Louisiana territory to the jurisdiction of the United States, and that was in the comparatively liberal slave code which not only gave to the slave a status something above that of chattel property but also assured to the freedman a more favorable position than that accorded him under Anglo-Saxon law and practice.³⁵ When Louisiana was organized as a territory and later as a state, most of the provisions of the French Code Noir were continued except for certain modifications to bring it into conformity with Anglo-American custom.³⁶

32 "Some Missions of the Mississippi Valley," *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, XIV, 189. See also Hercule Brassac to Bishop Rosati in *Catholic Historical Review*, III, 451.

33 Baudier, *op. cit.*, 206; Moody, *op. cit.*, 90-91.

34 Gray, *op. cit.*, I, 522. Gray attributes the comparatively more humane treatment to 1) the relatively non-commercial character of economic life in Louisiana under French and Spanish rule, 2) differences of national attitude.

35 *Ibid.*, 523-527; Phillips, *op. cit.*, 438; *Boston Pilot*, April 12, 1856.

36 The chief modifications were as follows: 1) Recognition of the slave "peculium" was withdrawn though slaves were granted by implication a power to enter contracts for self purchase; 2) Slave marriages were declared void of all civil effect; 3) Jurisdiction over slave crime was transferred to courts of inferior grade. Phillips, *op. cit.*, 493-494; also Moody, *op. cit.*, 87-89; H. H. Bancroft, *Slave-Trading in the Old South*, 197-198.

In spite of restrictions like that of a law of 1812 which confined the franchise to white citizens, the freedmen of Louisiana, prior to the reaction which set in throughout the South with the rise of abolitionism in the mid-thirties, were less hampered by restrictions and suspicion than in other parts of the United States, a fact which has been accounted for both by the Latin influence and by the presence in the state of a large number of persons of mixed blood possessed of superior mentality and abilities. This group was drawn largely from the children of white fathers who were given exceptional educational opportunities and whose manumission was frequently accompanied by gifts of money, land, or other properties.³⁷ The lack of discrimination against these persons of color which was characteristic of the Creole attitude was reinforced by judicial practice in the state courts under which persons of mixed blood were considered free until proved otherwise while the Negro, by contrast, was considered slave until proved free.³⁸ Until 1846 the courts were guided by the principle that "once free for an hour, free forever", a theory which was also the outgrowth of French law.³⁹

The establishment of the federal government and the acceptance on a national scale of the principle of religious liberty resulted in a considerable expansion of the Catholic population elsewhere in the United States.⁴⁰ Nowhere, however, in the South at this time or indeed throughout the whole pre-war period was this growth comparable to that in the North where, during these same years, European immigration was responsible for a substantial increase in the number of Catholics. Such

³⁷ Phillips, *op. cit.*, 430, 438-439.

³⁸ Catterall, *op. cit.*, III, 392-393; Adelle v. Beauregard, I, Mart. La. 183, Fall 1810, *ibid.*, 447; Sally Miller v. Belmonti, II, Rob. La. 339, July 1845, *ibid.*, 570.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 389-390; Elizabeth Thomas v. Generis, *et al.*, 16 La. 483, Dec. 1840, *ibid.*, 529; Josephine v. Poultney, I La. An. 329, Nov. 1846, *ibid.*, 578.

⁴⁰ Shea, *op. cit.*, III, 365 ff.; Bishop Flaget to Pius VII, *Catholic Historical Review*, I, 305-317; Peter Guilday, *Life and Times of John England*, I, 526.

immigrants as did find their way into the slave section were, for the most, poor laborers who held no slaves, and the greater number of Catholic slaveholders continued to be concentrated in Maryland and Louisiana. Elsewhere the church membership was on the whole small, poor in material resources, and insignificant in its effect upon the life and the thought of the community.⁴¹

The total number of Catholic Negroes in the ante-bellum South was similarly restricted. It is impossible to give an accurate figure of their numbers but it has been estimated that, at the time of emancipation, there were about 100,000 including both slaves and freedmen, three-fifths of whom were located in Maryland and Louisiana.⁴² This concentration is not difficult to understand since as a usual thing the slave shared his master's religion, and the proportion would naturally be greatest in those sections where Catholics were most numerous.

41 For brief accounts of the dioceses comprised within the limits of slave territory see Shea, *op. cit.*, III, IV, and Guilday, *op. cit.*, I, 523-531. The Flaget report to Pius VII has an account of conditions in Tennessee and the Mississippi Valley. See also "Some Missions of the Mississippi", *op. cit.*; Hercule Brassac to Rosati, *op. cit.*; B. Raho to Bishop Chanche in *Freeman's Journal*, Oct. 12, 19, Nov. 2, 9, 1850; John England, "History of the Charleston Diocese", *Works*, III, 262-263.

42 Gillard, *op. cit.*, 91-95. Gillard estimates 62,500 for Louisiana, 16,000 for Maryland, and 21,500 for the rest of the country.

CHAPTER III

AMERICAN CATHOLICS AND THE SLAVE SYSTEM

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL accounts, the records of various religious establishments, and other contemporary reports make it possible to reconstruct to some extent life among the Negroes owned by Catholics. From these sources emerges also a picture of the more general aspects of the slave system as it took form among the members of the Catholic congregation.

Charles Gayarré, the historian of Louisiana, has given us a description of slave management as he remembered it on the large sugar plantation of his Creole grandfather, who was an efficient and successful planter. On this estate the slave quarters were comfortable, and each family had an individual plot upon which to raise vegetables, hogs, and other food for their own use and for sale to the master. They were permitted to gather drift wood in their free time and sell it to the owner. When extra work was required they were paid for it in some way or given additional free time. The slaves seemed to be contented and in good health, and Gayarré could recall no instance of runaways.

A kind of military discipline prevailed, the workers being summoned to and from work by bells, and assigned in gangs to the various jobs. Before going into the fields each day they assembled in front of the main house where a male member of the family was always present to lead them in morning prayers. A similar procedure was followed on their return from work in the evening. Mr. Gayarré did not remember having seen a slave whipped but occasionally one of them would be put in the stocks for the night or during the Sunday holiday.¹

More specific information as to diet and clothing on a prosperous Creole plantation of the mid-century is available

¹ Charles Gayarré, "A Louisiana Sugar Plantation of the Old Régime," *Harper's New Monthly Magazine*, March, 1887, 606-621.

from the records of the Valcour Aime plantation in St. James' Parish in southern Louisiana. There the weekly food ration consisted of 5½ pounds of mess-pork and as much meal and potatoes as was desired. In addition the slaves had their own pigs and poultry and each adult was required to cultivate a vegetable garden. The surplus they were permitted to sell to the master or to chance customers. The clothing allowance for the Aime slaves consisted of two suits of clothes, two pairs of shoes, one hat, and one blanket per year.²

Other accounts give a picture of life on the better managed Catholic plantations in different sections of the country—of the physical well being of the slaves, friendly relations with the master, kind treatment by members of the family, concern for their spiritual needs, and respect for the integrity of their family relationships.³ All of this adds up, of course, merely to what we know of the usual well regulated plantation in the pre-war South. Any attempt to draw general conclusions from source material of this sort as to the management of Catholic plantations distinct from Protestant is obviously out of the question.

At the risk of laboring the point, it must be repeated that in the main such slaveholders did not differ from owners of other creeds nor were they actuated by any loftier motives.⁴ Just as the lot of the average slave was generally more comfort-

2 T. B. Thorpe, "Sugar and the Sugar Region of Louisiana", *Harper's Magazine*, VII, 746-767; U. B. Phillips, *Plantation and Frontier Documents*, I, 214-230.

3 C. B. Swisher, *Roger B. Taney*, 13-14; Taney to Rev. Samuel Nott, *Proceedings of the Mass. Historical Society*, XII, 444-447; R. M. Johnson, "The Georgia Negro Before, During, and Since the Civil War", *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, VI, 353-367; A. J. Thebaud, *Forty Years in the United States*, 68-71, 129-130; J. L. Spalding, *Life of the Most Reverend M. J. Spalding*, 136-139; V. A. Moody, *Slavery on Louisiana Sugar Plantations*, 65-77; H. A. Trexler, *Slavery in Missouri*, 83-88. Cf. to general treatment of slave system in such studies as A. B. Phillips, *American Negro Slavery* and R. B. Flanders, *Plantation Slavery in Georgia*.

4 J. T. Gillard, *Colored Catholics in the United States*, 43-44.

able in the older parts of the country and in sections where smaller holdings predominated, so it was among those owned by Catholics. Thus, in a state like Kentucky where the predominance of small farms made for a closer and more patriarchal relationship between master and slave, conditions were more acceptable from the point of view of the Church than in isolated localities, on the larger plantations where management was entrusted to an overseer, or among the slaves of the less prosperous Creole planters.⁵

The attitude of these Creoles of Louisiana towards the material needs of their slaves varied considerably. As a rule those on the more successful plantations were better provided for than where the owners were struggling to establish themselves. Creoles and Americans frequently accused each other of harsh treatment, and the truth of the matter probably is that both were more rigorous while "on the make" or when they were in financial difficulties.⁶

It is equally true of the spiritual life of slaves held by Catholics, as in the matter of physical care and treatment, that the degree of interest shown by the master was influenced to a considerable extent by the prevailing custom of the community. Maryland public opinion was, by the early nineteenth century, on the whole, tolerant of efforts designed to give the slave a more adequate understanding of religion so long as it did not unsettle him or deprive his owner of his time and usefulness, and probably the majority of Catholics in that state were simi-

⁵ Spalding, *op. cit.*, 139-140; Thebaud, *op. cit.*, 71; Trexler, *op. cit.*, 89-99; Charles Lyell, *A Second Visit to the United States of North America*, II, 160; James Buckingham, *The Slave States of America*, I, 375-376; Phillips, *op. cit.*, 241-244; Alice Dunbar-Nelson, "People of Color in Louisiana", *Journal of Negro History*, II, 62-64; F. L. Olmstead, *The Cotton Kingdom*, I, 337-340. See also an extract from the letter of a southern bishop (name not given), July 14, 1860, quoted in Augustin Cochin, *Results of Slavery*, 394-395.

⁶ Moody, *op. cit.*, 76-77; T. L. Nichols describing a trip through Louisiana, *Boston Pilot*, Feb. 19, 1859.

larly inclined.⁷ On such plantations there were usually devout men or women who would devote some time to teaching at least the rudiments of religious truth to the Negroes, especially the children, and cooperate with the priest during his visitation if the plantation was some distance from the regular parish church or see to it that the slaves attended services in the local chapel.⁸

Inadequate church facilities and lack of priests interfered with the fulfillment of these obligations in many parts of the South. In 1820 Hercule Brassac, pastor of a recently organized Louisiana parish, described the congregation he had found awaiting him as "plunged in the grossest ignorance and dulness for their eternal welfare." But he added:

It was not their fault; they lived at a great distance from the church and they were but seldom visited by their pastors. They begin to be a little more anxious to learn their christian duties and their attendance to Mass on Sundays is also more regular; it is on those days only that we have the chance of instructing them; they live scattered about, and it is impossible to gather them oftener; they are eager to give some education to their children and by that means Religion gains more because they insist that the catechism may be the first book put in their children's hands. The slaves are in general treated with humanity. But the article of marriage among them is on the same footing as on the coast of the Mississippi.⁹

⁷ C. G. Woodson, *The Education of the Negro prior to 1861*, 107-108; M. F. Rouse, *A Study of the Development of Negro Education under Catholic Auspices in Maryland and the District of Columbia*, 102; Gillard, *op. cit.*, 48.

⁸ Rouse, *op. cit.*, 28; A. S. Will, *Life of James Gibbons*, I, 197. For Kentucky see Spalding, *op. cit.*, 139-140; for Missouri, Trexler, *op. cit.*, 83-88.

⁹ To Joseph Rosati, June 27, 1820, *Catholic Historical Review*, III, 450-451. Neglect of the church tenets on marriage was a common source of complaint by missionaries who worked among the slaves. S. L. Theobald, "Catholic Missionary Work among the Colored People of the United States", *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society*, XXXV, 340-342; Bishop Augustine Verot, Sermon of January 4, 1861, *Freeman's Journal*, July 9, 1864; and his post-war Pastoral, *Catholic Telegraph*, Nov. 8, 1865. See also *Catholic Telegraph*, June 3, May 20, 1863; Cochin, *op. cit.*, Bishop McGill of Richmond cited the Civil War as evidence of divine wrath at disregard of the marriage laws of the Church. John McGill, *Our Faith the Victory*, 430-431.

Eighteen years later when Richard Miles took possession of the see of Nashville, Tennessee, he had no resident priest to assist him. His congregation numbered only about 300 persons but they were so dispersed through the state that he had to travel over 450 miles on horseback to complete his first diocesan visitation.¹⁰ Other pioneer bishops in the South reported a similar situation. John England of Charleston, for example, in an appeal for funds to increase mission facilities in the Carolinas, stated his opinion that the scattered Catholic population would make regular parishes unlikely for many years.¹¹ When the diocese of Natchitoches, Louisiana, was established with Augustus Martin as bishop, there were but five priests to serve a rural population of some 25,000 Catholics.¹²

In Louisiana difficulties, already noted in connection with the colonial history of the Church in that region, persisted well into the national period. The development of the sugar raising industry on a wide scale, coinciding as it did with the transfer of Louisiana to the United States, served to complicate the whole question of the relationship between clergy and laity and the slaves. Those priests who were intent on performing their function as shepherd to bond and free alike were deprived of whatever support they had been able to secure in the past from a civil authority under which Catholicism was the established religion. The plantation system was itself transformed to involve production on a larger scale with a consequent increase in the number of slaves per unit. Catholic Creoles of southern Louisiana, who were already established and prospering economically, took up the culture of the sugar cane and became in the succeeding years a conservative bulwark for the slave system.

10 J. G. Shea, *History of the Catholic Church in the U. S.*, III, 657-658; M. M. Meline and E. F. X. McSweeney, *Story of the Mountain*, I, 405-406; Victor O'Daniel, *The Father of the Church in Tennessee*, 316-326.

11 *U. S. Catholic Miscellany*, Nov. 14, 1840.

12 Shea, *op. cit.*, III, 675.

The immigration of the period following the American occupancy was predominantly Protestant in character.¹³ Catholic tradition, overwhelmed in the upper part of the state where even under the Latin régime it had been sparse, was restricted to New Orleans and the lower parishes where the greater number of slaveholders had long been concentrated.¹⁴ And there the effective application of this tradition, as it concerned the slave, was seriously hampered by difficulties within the church membership.

In addition, as Roger Baudier, the historian of Louisiana Catholicism has pointed out, there "was always present the prejudice of slave owners and the peculiar attitude of many towards the slaves" to hamper the work of evangelization and, at times, to interfere actively with the participation of the slaves in religious services.¹⁵ Typical of such prejudice was the attempt of a group of planters, members of St. Martin's Church in the Attakapas country, to keep the slaves from receiving communion with the white people. Several times they actually drove the Negroes from the altar rail. The pastor, Père Jan, went to the defense of the slaves but his efforts in their behalf aroused considerable resentment among the masters and their families.¹⁶

Slave holdings by the clergy in a Protestant country naturally did not approximate those in places where Catholicism was the predominate faith. In so far as the individual priests were concerned it was generally a case of ownership of one or two "servants" for use about the rectory and church build-

13 The refugees from San Domingo who sought haven in New Orleans from revolutionary upheaval in their homeland, and the German and Irish immigrants who entered by way of that port when the full tide of European migration set in were the exceptions to this.

14 R. W. Shugg, *Origins of Class Struggle in Louisiana*, 17-19, 62-63.

15 Roger Baudier, *The Catholic Church in Louisiana*, 433.

16 M. A. C., "The Church of the Attakapas", *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, XIV, 483, n. 1.

ings.¹⁷ Holdings by the orders were on a somewhat larger scale since the agricultural activities carried on in connection with their institutions were an "almost indispensable adjunct" of educational and social foundations of the time.¹⁸ However, the number of such communities in the pre-war South was small.

It was customary among the religious orders to purchase slaves as they were needed.¹⁹ Sometimes they were acquired with property, in other instances they were transferred from a parent institution to a new foundation. Thus, when Father Charles Van Quickenborne went out in 1823 to establish a branch of the Society of Jesus in Missouri he took with him six slaves who had been turned over by the Maryland province.²⁰ Buried in the graveyard of the recently restored Carmelite convent at Port Tobacco, Maryland, are several slaves brought in as part of the dowry of some of the sisters.

17 For examples of such ownership by Bishop Flaget, Father Badin, and others see R. J. Murphy, "The Catholic Church in the United States during the Civil War Period", *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society*, XXXIX, 114-115. Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis was another owner on a small scale, John Rothensteiner, *History of the Archdiocese of St. Louis*, II, 210.

18 Victor O'Daniel, *The Right Reverend Edward Dominick Fenwick*, O.P., 107-108. In 1859 there were 20 slaves attached to the Jesuit farm at Florissant, Missouri. Gilbert Garraghan, *The Jesuits of the Middle United States*, I, 612. The Dominicans used slave labor on a similar farm at St. Rose's in Kentucky. Students, novices, and priests all assisted in working the farm but the slaves performed much of the work. The farm was practically self-sufficing, and what the community did not consume was sold in the local market. O'Daniel, *The Father of the Church in Tennessee*, 123, 125-135. In 1826 an accounting of the property attached to Mount St. Mary's at Emmitsburg, Md. reported 7 male slaves and 10 females. Meline and McSweeney, *op. cit.*, I, 157. The house in which the St. Mary's slaves were housed still stands. It is divided into a number of small rooms, each having a fireplace. Theodore Maynard, *The Reed and the Rock*, 135.

19 When Father John Dubois founded his school at Emmitsburg he bought 5 slaves, paying \$400 for 3 females, \$500 for a man, and \$300 for a boy of 12. Meline and McSweeney, *op. cit.*, I, 13. Father Victor O'Daniel, O.P. of the Dominican House of Studies, Washington, D. C. described to the author a similar policy of the Dominicans at St. Rose's. See also Baudier, *op. cit.*, 131-132; Moody, *op. cit.*, 90, 131, 145.

20 Garraghan, *op. cit.*, I, 611.

There are likewise records of sales both by individuals and by the orders.²¹ Between 1793 and 1796 the Maryland Jesuits sold nine Negroes from the plantation at Bohemia, which was at that time in financial difficulty.²² Again, in 1838, the provincial reported the sale of forty-nine slaves to a planter in Louisiana, the proceeds being used to meet certain obligations to the archbishop of Baltimore.²³

On the whole such groups seem to have opposed the alienation of slave holdings unless financial stress required it or consistent insubordination or immorality on the part of a slave made it desirable to be rid of him. The answer given by a Jesuit superior-general to a query from one of the American priests throws some light on the attitude of his order in such matters: "Such as are scandalous and immoral, yes—after admonitions and corrections—these can be sold in case they are incorrigible, but only if the thing can be done safely, and in every case only to Catholic masters."²⁴ The Dominicans apparently adopted a similar policy, and so too, doubtless, did other religious orders.²⁵

It was a matter of some concern to what section of the country slaves might be taken after sale lest, in places where facilities for the practice of their religion were inadequate or plantation conditions unfavorable, they "lose these Christian principles" which "they had imbibed".²⁶ The deed of transfer to Father Van Quickenborne was expressive of this policy. By its terms

²¹ There is a copy of a bill of sale for a slave girl in the Diary of Bishop Benedict Flaget. The girl was sold in 1815 for \$400. *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, XXV, 38.

²² Thomas Hughes, *The History of the Society of Jesus in North America*, Doc. I Part II, 748-749.

²³ *Ibid.*, 1122; see also *Catholic Telegraph*, April 8, 1863.

²⁴ Garraghan, *op. cit.*, I, 613, n. 49. Archbishop Carroll objected to such sales to meet the deficits of the various manors in Maryland on the grounds that "sales of Negroes for life" were contrary to the policy of the order. Hughes, *op. cit.*, Doc. I Part II, 812.

²⁵ Father O'Daniel to the author.

²⁶ Hughes, *op. cit.*, Text II, 561.

he received authority "to govern and dispose of said slaves as he thinks proper, and to sell any or all of them to humane and Christian masters who will purchase them for their own use, should they at any time become refractory, or their conduct grievously immoral." ²⁷ Similarly Brother Joseph Mobberly cautioned Maryland planters against selling their slaves to the rice fields of the Carolinas where he feared they would be subject to hard labor, loss of faith, and separation of families. "Will the planters of Maryland", he asked, "charge their consciences with deeds so shocking to the feelings of a Christian, and thus draw down the curse of God upon themselves and their posterity?" ²⁸

The necessity of protecting the integrity of family relationships in accordance with Catholic teaching which made marriage a part of the sacramental system, was likewise an important consideration. Indeed it was not uncommon for a community either to purchase the husband or wife of one of their own servants or to arrange for the sale of their slave to the owner of his mate. Thus we find a Jesuit pastor writing to his superior:

I find it necessary to inform yr Revce, that this family must loose her best negroe for labor—the reason is his wife belongs to another person, and the master has ordered her and her children to be sold. I cannot buy her; too much is demanded—\$500 for her and three children—they are all girls of whom we have 10 or 12 already in our family. I shall be obliged to sell our man, not to separate man and wife.²⁹

This reluctance to dispose of their slaves by sale not infrequently presented the members of such communities with a very real problem since support of the "supernumeraries", as

²⁷ Garraghan, *op. cit.*, I, 612.

²⁸ Joseph Mobberly, *Diary*, 83.

²⁹ Hughes, *op. cit.*, Doc. I Part I, 383; Meline and McSweeney, *op. cit.*, I, 64. For an account of the recall to Rome of the superiors of a religious order in the South who sold slaves without provision for keeping their families intact, see *Catholic Telegraph*, April 8, 1863.

the excess were called, proved oftentimes a drain on resources, inadequate at best.³⁰ As a Jesuit official explained in 1835, when discussing the financial needs of the Maryland Fathers:

They have large farms; but hardly the fourth part is cultivated for want of capital. The produce is in great part consumed by the ever-increasing number of slaves, who, by reason of conscientious obligations to them, cannot be sold, and cannot be set at liberty, because of the great dangers to soul and body which they incur, if set free.³¹

To solve this problem and to supplement the revenue of the institution, the Negroes were sometimes leased out for varying periods of service.³²

From accounts of farm management in the Jesuit archives it is possible to get some idea of the treatment and physical condition of the "servants" attached to their farms.³³ It seems probable that the management of these establishments was in most particulars not unlike that on similar holdings of other religious communities, both of nuns and of priests. The Jesuit slaves usually lived in small houses of one or two rooms to which were attached plots for raising vegetables and poultry. In addition each one received an allotment of food which was often supplemented on feast days by special treats. Clothes were made on the place from cloth furnished by the owners, with an extra allowance for occasions like First Communion. Entries in the account book of the novitiate at Florissant, Missouri, show that there were occasional opportunities to earn a little money from overtime work or unusual tasks. Thus, on December sixth, 1839, "Little Peter" received twelve cents

30 Hughes, *op. cit.*, Doc. I Part I, 383, 544 n. 27, 231; Text II, 560-561.

31 *Ibid.*, Doc. Part II, 1119.

32 Meline and McSweeney, *op. cit.*, I, 73; Hughes, *op. cit.*, Doc. I Part II, 879.

33 Garraghan, *op. cit.*, I, 615-619; Hughes, *op. cit.*, Text II, 561-563; Baudier, *op. cit.*, 160.

"for making a broom". Some months later "Succy" earned two dollars by "raising poultry", and "Moses" was given one dollar "for working for the house".³⁴

The conduct of the slaves was subject to various regulations for infractions of which a common punishment was the docking of leisure time. Other penalties no doubt depended upon the inclination of the one in charge, as well as his previous experience with the slave system.³⁵ The religious training which they received and the surroundings in which they lived were probably deterrents to misbehavior of the more serious kind, while the priestly functions of the masters would naturally tend to win for them a measure of respect denied the lay owner. The tendency of slaves in some such establishments to stay on after receiving their freedom may be considered as proof that they were reasonably contented with the treatment accorded them.³⁶

It was a common belief among those religious who performed administrative duties that the slave system was economically unprofitable for their purposes. A certain inefficiency due to lack of adequate supervision and frequent changes of personnel among the directors would seem inevitable from the nature of such an organization. Furthermore, conscientious scruples would oftentimes hinder its members from getting out of the slaves all the advantages which a layman might. This was the opinion of Brother Mobberly, who objected to the use of slave labor because practical experience in managing several of the Jesuit manors in Maryland had convinced him of the economic disadvantages of the system. Referring to the St. Inigo's farm, he wrote:

³⁴ Garraghan, *op. cit.*, I, 615.

³⁵ Mobberly, *op. cit.*, 142-143; Garraghan, *op. cit.*, I, 617-619.

³⁶ Meline and McSweeney, *op. cit.*, I, 516, 554; Father O'Daniel recalls conversations with ex-slaves of the Dominican farm at St. Rose's who reported that Negroes belonging to religious communities enjoyed a certain prestige among their fellows. See also O'Daniel, *An American Apostle. The Very Reverend Matthew Anthony O'Brien, O.P.*, 169, 175.

Having duly considered things, I then thought as I do now, that the farm would do much better without them (slaves).

Exclude the Blacks and the corn system; take in 5 or 6 apprentice boys; hire 2 or 3 strong men that understand farming; manage well, and be assured that as good or better wheat crops will be made on the farm then, than can be made under the present system. The above plan would do well, but the following would do better.³⁷

He went on to suggest leasing the land with good houses to reliable tenants who would relieve the priests of responsibility for the management of the farms.

Brother Mobberly was equally emphatic in his conviction that wasteful and inefficient methods of cultivation made slave labor unprofitable for neighboring planters as well. "Slavery, corn, and tobacco must go together", he declared. The problem of managing the slaves presented another difficulty, insurmountable according to his way of thinking. "As slaves are very discontented in their present state of servitude, and are becoming more corrupt and more worthless every year, I do not think that the planters can ever succeed under the prevailing system".³⁸

Brother Matthew Smith, who before entering the Society of Jesus served as overseer on his brother's plantation in South Carolina, was more favorably disposed towards the slave system, but he agreed with other directors of the novitiate farm at Florissant that slave labor was unprofitable and burdensome for the Jesuits.³⁹ The difficulty of managing the slaves, the expense of feeding and clothing their wives and children, the burden of caring for the sick and infirm, seemed a drain on the personnel and resources of the order out of proportion to the productivity of such labor.

37 Mobberly, *op. cit.*, 139-140; Garraghan, *op. cit.*, I, 617-619.

38 Mobberly, *op. cit.*, 140.

39 Garraghan, *op. cit.*, I, 617.

Quite aside from any feelings which they may have had about slavery in the abstract, the Jesuits obviously had no cause for regret from an economic point of view when it was abolished. Indeed the process of elimination had begun among the Jesuit houses sometime before. As early as 1836, a Maryland provincial advised Father Verhaegen in St. Louis to work the college farm in that city with free labor as the more profitable, a suggestion which Father Verhaegen accepted.⁴⁰ By 1847 all the establishments in the Missouri province except the novitiate had changed to hired help.⁴¹ On farms like that attached to the Florissant novitiate the problem was different from that in houses where slaves were used chiefly for domestic service or outside work on a small scale.⁴² Some form of labor was necessary because of the dependence of the novitiate upon the products of the farm, there were no funds available for the wages of free workers, and it was believed that the cost of day laborers would exceed the amount which might be realized from the sale of the slaves.⁴³

Manumissions were probably less common among ecclesiastical bodies in this country than in Latin America. In most of the southern states the right of manumission was subject to legal restrictions which made removal from the state a common condition for emancipation, limited the right to manumit by will, and sometimes required a special act of the legislature for individual cases.⁴⁴ Among the clergy there was a feeling that in any case the position of the freedman in the United

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 618.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 618. A similar tendency showed itself at Mt. St. Mary's in Emmitsburg, Md. In August, 1840, the college authorities petitioned the legislature for permission to free five slaves. On September 8 of that year they refused the offer of a slave boy. Meline and McSweeney, *op. cit.*, I, 408-409.

⁴² In 1859, the Florissant farm had 20 slaves. Garraghan, *op. cit.*, I, 612.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 618-619.

⁴⁴ H. T. Catterall, *Judicial Cases Concerning American Slavery and the Negro*, II, 267-268, 480; III, 1-2, 126-127.

States made liberty a doubtful blessing from the economic point of view and one which was fraught with danger to his spiritual welfare.⁴⁵ This conviction was largely responsible for ecclesiastical support of the colonization movement. As Francis P. Kenrick, at that time bishop of Philadelphia, wrote in 1841: "it was praiseworthy through religious motives" to free slaves, provided there was an opportunity for them to go at once to Liberia.⁴⁶ In 1833, the Second Provincial Council of Baltimore authorized the establishment of a mission in Liberia, appeals for its support appeared in the Catholic press, and collections were taken up in some of the churches.⁴⁷

Catholic laymen took a similar stand. The economist and publisher, Mathew Carey, the Philadelphia journalist, Robert Walsh, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, each supported some form of colonization though they differed as to details.⁴⁸ Carey, for example, endorsed the Liberian project of the American Colonization Society. Walsh, on the other hand, influenced partly by his Irish background, favored locating the settlement somewhere in the western hemisphere where there would be less danger of British aggression.⁴⁹

As a result of this interest in colonization two priests, Edward Barron of Philadelphia and John Kelly of New York, accompanied by a lay catechist, Denis Pindar of Baltimore, went out in December, 1841, to establish a mission in Liberia.⁵⁰ Because

45 Hughes, *op. cit.*, Doc. Part II, 1119; Garraghan, *op. cit.*, I, 619.

46 Quoted in Theobald, *op. cit.*, 332.

47 Peter Guilday, *The Life and Times of John England*, II, 263, 274-276; *Catholic Herald*, Oct. 14, 1841; *Catholic Advocate*, Nov. 6, 1841.

48 Mathew Carey, *Letters on the Colonization Society*; Robert Walsh, *An Appeal from the Judgments of Great Britain Respecting the U. S. of America*, 398-400; Sister M. Frederick Lochemes, *Robert Walsh His Story*, 114-115; E. H. Smith, *Charles Carroll of Carrollton*, 270.

49 Walsh, *op. cit.*, 398.

50 Thomas Meehan, "Liberia", *Catholic Encyclopedia*, IX, 216-217; Edward Barron to F. P. Kenrick, Feb. 13, 1845, *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, VII, 383-386.

of climatic conditions and other difficulties they returned home after a few years. The mission lapsed for a time to be resumed later in the century under European auspices.

In considering the kind of activity carried on among the American slaves by the Catholic clergy one must bear in mind always that the Church is essentially a religious institution whose attention must be directed first to the religious life of its communicants, and only secondarily to their social and economic life. Thus the most pressing duty of the priest who labored in the slave section was to watch over the spiritual needs of the Negroes who came under his charge.

Church registers—which were usually kept separately for white and black—show that slaves were baptized and married in accordance with the law of the Church in such matters even though the latter ceremony had no legal recognition in the Anglo-Saxon slave code.⁵¹ They attended services and partook of the sacraments in the same chapels as the white people but in keeping with the usual custom in the South they were commonly assigned to a separate section in the rear or side aisles.⁵² Special instruction in religious doctrine and practice was given by the priests in the local churches or, if the situation of the plantation made this impractical, in classes held when the missionary made his occasional visitation to that locality.

As part of the catechetical course, slaves were occasionally taught to read.⁵³ However, as abolitionist activity increased, anxiety on the part of the owners lest such instruction have a disturbing influence upon their slaves made necessary the

⁵¹ Trexler, *op. cit.*, 87-88; Baudier, *op. cit.*, 198, 239; J. J. O'Connell, *Catholicity in the Carolinas and Georgia*, 21; Father Joseph Brauner to author, January 9, 1941, reporting on records of the Old Cathedral in St. Louis.

⁵² Meline and McSweeney, *op. cit.*, I, 46; Baudier, *op. cit.*, 365; Rouse, *op. cit.*, 34-35; *The Pilot*, Feb. 13, 1841. It was the general tendency among Protestants to have separate churches although domestic servants were apt to accompany the masters to services. Phillips, *op. cit.*, 418-419.

⁵³ Joseph Butsch, "Negro Catholics in the United States", *Catholic Historical Review*, III, 35-37; Woodson, *op. cit.*, 107-108; *Special Report of the Commissioner of Education for 1871*, 218; Rouse, *op. cit.*, 50, 100.

use of a different technique since Catholics were no less susceptible to these fears than their Protestant brethren. Under this method the slaves were taught to memorize the commandments of God and of the Church, and the duty and manner of assisting at mass and receiving the sacraments was explained orally.⁵⁴

For many years, indeed until after the close of the Civil War, all this was of necessity largely a matter of individual effort. The energies of the early bishops were pretty well occupied with details of organization and problems inherent in the establishment of the Church in a new country, while the local priests were all too few to cope with the tasks which confronted them. In consequence, in spite of some attempts at a cooperative approach to the problem of caring for free and slave Negroes, no joint efforts were undertaken.⁵⁵

So it is to the labors of individual priests that one must turn for some idea of the way the work was carried on. Stephen Badin, missionary for many years to the Kentucky pioneers, was particularly interested in the "poor servants of colour" and besides the attention which he himself gave in the course of his ceaseless missionary travels, he appointed catechists at the different stations to assume the responsibility of instruction during his absence.⁵⁶ Another of the Kentucky missionaries, Charles Nerinckx, preferred service among the "children and servants" to any other duties. During his stay in a locality he would have them assemble daily for instruction.⁵⁷ His interest in the slaves prompted him to favor the admission to the religious community, which he sponsored, of Negro women who would devote themselves to the service of their own

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 28; *Special Report*, 218-219.

⁵⁵ Peter Guilday, *op. cit.*, II, 274-276. For post-war cooperation see Gillard, *op. cit.*, 112-114; Spalding, *op. cit.*, 340-342; Pastoral of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, P. G. Mode, *Sourcebook of American Church History*, 471-475.

⁵⁶ M. J. Spalding, *Sketches of Kentucky*, 67.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 144-145.

race.⁵⁸ Several were in fact received as postulants but did not complete their novitiate because Nerinckx's successor deemed the time inopportune for such an innovation. However, the sisters of the Loretto community had as one of their functions the task of assisting "aged, decrepit and useless slaves."⁵⁹ In the more sparsely settled sections where Catholic congregations were dependent upon the occasional service of travelling clergy, priests like John Odin, Hercule Brassac, or Father Raho, assumed the duty of baptizing the slaves, regularizing their marriages, and giving what instruction was possible in the limited time at their disposal.⁶⁰

The degree of interest shown by members of the hierarchy during these years varied.⁶¹ John England, first bishop of Charleston, whose diocese embraced three slave states, and to whom the problem of the Negro was a matter of special concern, customarily celebrated a special Sunday mass for them in his cathedral and when not absent on diocesan visitations, he himself led their Sunday afternoon instruction class.⁶² Archbishop Whitfield of Baltimore gave his support to the Sulpician Fathers and the little group of colored women who undertook the organization of a Negro sisterhood to provide more adequate religious and educational facilities for their fellow Catholics.⁶³ In the face of some opposition he advised against postponement of plans which had been sometime under way and in 1829 the Oblate Sisters of Providence were formally established.⁶⁴ This

⁵⁸ Camillus Maes, *The Life of Rev. Charles Nerinckx*, 252-291.

⁵⁹ J. G. Shea, "A Pioneer of the West", *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, V, 499-501.

⁶⁰ "Some Missions of the Mississippi Valley", *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, XIV, 189; Hercule Brassac to Joseph Rosati, *Catholic Historical Review*, III, 451; B. Raho to Bishop Chanche, *Freeman's Journal*, Oct. 12, 19, Nov. 2, 9, 1850.

⁶¹ Theobald, *op. cit.*, 329-331.

⁶² Gillard, *op. cit.*, 73, J. L. O'Brien, *John England, Bishop of Charleston*, 204.

⁶³ Butsch, *op. cit.*, 44-45.

⁶⁴ Joseph Code, "A Colored Educator before the Civil War", *Catholic World*, CXLIV, 440.

proved to be the first permanent community of colored nuns in the United States. William Du Bourg of New Orleans was another of the early primates who, as priest and bishop, took the Negroes under his special charge.⁶⁵

In sections where the number of Catholics was sufficient there was some attempt at charitable and missionary work among the free Negroes. Among the refugees from San Domingo who settled in Baltimore and New Orleans were a number of educated and intelligent Negroes who became active in efforts to increase the opportunities available to the free colored population. In Baltimore they were assisted by the French Sulpician Fathers, one of whom, Jacques Hector Nicholas Joubert, was the special apostle of the Negroes and largely instrumental in establishing the Oblate sisterhood.⁶⁶ Under the auspices of the Sulpicians and the Oblates, day schools and Sunday classes were set up to provide religious and secular instruction as well as training in the practical arts.⁶⁷

Similar classes were established in the District of Columbia in connection with certain of the Catholic institutions there.⁶⁸ In 1827 Maria Becraft, a colored woman of unusual ability, started a seminary for colored girls in Georgetown.⁶⁹ Miss Becraft, who later joined the Oblates, received assistance for her ambitious undertaking from the Visitation Nuns and from some of the Georgetown Jesuits. Far to the South, in Louisiana, certain clergymen and lay persons cooperated in activities of the

65 Gillard, *The Catholic Church and the Negro*, 18-19. Bishop Miles founded a school for free Negroes in Nashville. Report to Propaganda, Aug. 13, 1847, printed in O'Daniel, *The Father of the Church in Tennessee*, 422-423.

66 Butsch, *op. cit.*, 44-45.

67 Rouse, *op. cit.*, 38-43; Thomas Meehan, "Mission Work among Colored Catholics", *Historical Records and Studies of the U. S. Catholic Historical Society*, VIII, 119.

68 Rouse, *op. cit.*, 29-30, 51; Special Report, *op. cit.*, 217-219; *Freeman's Journal*, March 22, 1845.

69 Special Report, *op. cit.*, 204-205.

same sort.⁷⁰ A second religious order for colored women, the Congregation of the Holy Family, was founded in New Orleans in 1842 for catechetical and charitable work among their fellow Negroes.

In Charleston, Bishop England sponsored the formation of a community to labor among poor white and colored girls and in the summer of 1835 he opened a school for free Negroes. The time was unpropitious, for it coincided with the anti-abolitionist riots brought about by an attempt of northern anti-slavery societies to distribute their propaganda through the mails.⁷¹ During the general excitement attendant upon these disorders Bishop England was accused of abolitionist sympathies with the result that his personal safety as well as that of his cathedral and rectory was endangered. Prompt action by the city authorities and by leading members of his congregation saved him but the pressure of public opinion forced him to close his school. In his report to the annual convention of the diocese the Bishop referred regretfully to the "unwarrantable interference of strangers with our peculiar institution, of whose nature they are altogether ignorant", which had ended this promising experiment.⁷²

In other parts of the South, Catholic work among the Negroes, free and slave alike, was meagre and confined largely to Sunday school classes and informal teaching.⁷³ In a section where inadequacies of organization and lack of sufficient priests made it difficult to satisfy the needs of the white congregations it was impossible to give proper attention to the slaves who, ignorant and heathen, presented a peculiarly hard problem in

⁷⁰ Baudier, *op. cit.*, 364-365, 392, 396-397, 433; Meehan, *op. cit.*, 119.

⁷¹ Guilday, *op. cit.*, II, 151-156; *U. S. Catholic Miscellany*, Aug. 1, 1835.

⁷² *Ibid.*, Nov. 21, 1835.

⁷³ Rouse, *op. cit.*, 4; Theobald, *op. cit.*, 328-329; *Catholic Mirror*, March 22, 1853; Garraghan, *op. cit.*, III, 560-561. For a description of a northern effort—the activities carried on by a Jesuit of St. Joseph's Church in Philadelphia for the Negro Catholics of that city, see *Pilot*, June 15, 1861.

the most favorable circumstances.⁷⁴ Then, too, in so far as Catholic evangelizing was concerned, there were additional impediments resulting from the prevalence of anti-Catholic sentiment, the tendency of the slave to follow the religion of his master, and the greater appeal offered by the more emotionalized evangelical faiths.

Occasionally a Protestant planter might welcome the Catholic priest, either out of solicitude for the religious welfare of his slaves or because he believed such contact would improve their behavior and general usefulness, but Southerners on the whole were unsympathetic to Catholicism intellectually and mistrustful of its influence upon their bondsmen.⁷⁵ In these circumstances missionary endeavors like those carried on by the various Protestant sects in the decades just prior to the Civil War were almost impossible.⁷⁶ In consequence, what few con-

74 John Grassi, "The Catholic Religion in the U. S. in 1818", *American Catholic Historical Researches*, VIII, 106, 107; Guilday, *op. cit.*, II, 50; *U. S. Catholic Miscellany*, Nov. 14, 1840. Archbishop Whitfield of Baltimore, speaking of the exemplary Catholics to be found among the Maryland Negroes, expressed his regret at being unable to send missionaries to Virginia to undertake the conversion of Negroes in that state. Quoted from "Annales de la Propagation de la Foi", V, 722, in Henry De Courcey, *The Catholic Church in the U. S.*, 498. In a letter of Jan. 31, 1838 to the Paris Committee of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, his successor, Archbishop Eccleston, wrote:

To me there appears to be no race of men in this country, not excepting even the savages, among whom more good might be effected. But, unfortunately, instead of having missionaries to spare for them I have not even enough to attend to the wants of those, who from having been educated in the Catholic Religion, are more exposed to feel their spiritual destitution.—Quoted in *American Catholic Historical Researches*, IX, 141.

75 O'Connell, *op. cit.*, 44-45; Thebaud, *op. cit.*, 69-70; Father Raho to Bishop Chanche, *op. cit.*; Johnson, *op. cit.*, 365.

76 Luther Jackson, "Religious Instruction of Negroes, 1830-1860, with Special Reference to South Carolina", *Journal of Negro History*, XV, 72-114. For the plantation mission movement and other organized activity see Phillips, *op. cit.*, 314-322; Lyell, *op. cit.*, I, 362-368. For an account of one such Catholic mission at Natchez, Mississippi which had grown from 2 or 3 to 50 or 60 weekly attendants in the course of 2 or 3 months, see *Catholic Advocate*, May 10, 1842. For a letter of Bishop Elder of Natchez stressing the difficulties of Catholic missionary work among the slaves, see *Catholic Telegraph*, Sept. 9, 1863.

verts there were among the slaves were likely to fall away once the influence of the priest was removed, and whatever increase there was in the number professing Catholicism was confined to those held by Catholic owners. Of such slaves, a Catholic student, long concerned with the relationship of that Church to the Negro, has stated:

Despite the fact that in many instances Catholic masters watched over the religious interests of their slaves, the majority of Catholic slaves were Catholic in little more than name. Whatever they may have been quantitatively, qualitatively their religion had few of the deeply rooted principles which alone can influence the entire life of man. Those who were well grounded in the truths of the Faith, and consequently dominated by sound moral principles, were comparatively few.⁷⁷

As is generally true of any social problem which does not involve directly a question of dogma, the working of the slave system among Catholics seems to have reflected on the whole the custom and pattern of thought prevalent in the community. It is true that Catholic doctrine laid down certain limitations intended to protect the dignity and personality of the slave and to preserve the master from the occasion of sin through misuse of his powers or neglect of his responsibilities. Theoretically, adherents of the faith were bound in conscience to carry out these obligations among their own slaves in so far as lay within their power. Having done so they were in no sense required to undertake to reform the established order of society, even though the instruments devised for the maintenance of that order were far from perfect. For the clergy the primary responsibility was to insure to the slave that opportunity for

⁷⁷ Gillard, *op. cit.*, 260; T. L. Nichols to the editor of the *Boston Pilot*, *Pilot*, May 7, 1859; *Catholic Telegraph*, May 20, 1863; Eccleston, *op. cit.*; Gillard, *The Catholic Church and the Negro*, 13; O'Connell, *op. cit.*, 629; Verot, *op. cit.*

free and equal practice of his religion to which he was entitled by virtue of his human nature, and to instill in the master a sense of his duty to his servant. When it came to the practical application of these principles it is evident that the manner in which they were discharged depended upon the character, experience, and interest of the individuals concerned, as well as upon certain external influences associated with the milieu in which the institution was developed, and the status of the Catholic Church in that milieu.

CHAPTER IV

THE CHALLENGE OF IMMEDIACY

THE mid thirties, which witnessed in the North the rise of the abolitionist movement and in the South the development of a more positive defense of the slave system by political, intellectual, and religious leaders, ushered in a period of exceptional difficulties for the Catholic Church in the United States.¹ The tasks of establishing a uniform system of ecclesiastical discipline and practice, of maintaining purity of doctrine and ritual, of checking the evils of trusteeism which had been a frequent source of trouble between clergy and laity over the control of church property and the appointment of pastors, were not yet completed. The extension of missionary labors and the rapid expansion of organization incident to the formation of new bishoprics were matters of concern for the entire hierarchy.

Becoming apparent at this time also was the full magnitude of the task presented to the Church by the flood of immigration which had already set in, a task which was complicated by the fact that so many of the hierarchy and clergy were themselves of foreign birth and education and, in consequence, undergoing the same process of assimilation. Likewise upon the ecclesiastical leaders devolved the responsibility of guiding the faithful in the face of popular hostility to Catholicism which was manifesting itself anew in the form of organized propaganda and in outbursts of violence like the burning of the Ursuline convent in Charlestown, Massachusetts.²

1 W. S. Jenkins, *Pro-Slavery Thought in the Old South*, 48-106; W. P. and F. J. Garrison, *William Lloyd Garrison*, I, II; Gilbert Barnes, *The Antislavery Impulse*.

2 J. G. Shea, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States*, III, *passim*; Peter Guilday, *History of the Councils of Baltimore*, 162-163, 170-172; J. R. G. Hassard, *Life of John Hughes*, 51-71, 112-117, 193-197, 259-263; R. A. Billington, *The Protestant Crusade*, 85-219. The pastoral letters of the Provincial Councils of Baltimore during these years give a good picture of

As a natural concomitant of all this, members of the hierarchy were anxious to avoid any action which might tend to foster sectional difference among their followers, and to adhere firmly to what has been their generally accepted policy in the United States—official abstention from political questions. The method of organization adopted by the Church made the head of each episcopal see responsible for its governance in religious matters, and answerable directly to Rome but it was customary for the several bishops of the country to assemble in council from time to time to take action upon problems common to all of them. Between 1829 and 1849 nine provincial councils were held at Baltimore, during that period the metropolitan see for the Church in America. In 1852 the increase in hierarchical divisions made possible the calling of a plenary council.³ From none of these came any direct expression of opinion on the slavery question. Indeed, reference to national affairs appeared in the conciliar pronouncements only when anti-Catholic feeling was most pressing and it was considered necessary to give some advice to the laity on the responsibilities of citizenship.⁴

Actually, there was an indirect approach to the problem of slavery in action taken at some of these councils. At the close of the second solemn session of the Council of 1840 the Apostolic Letter of Gregory XVI on the slave trade was read to the assembled prelates, among whom representatives from the slave

contemporary church problems. See Guilday, *National Pastorals of the American Hierarchy*. W. N. Huggins, a Negro student of Catholicism and the Negro in the United States, criticizes all the Christian churches for failure to attack with sufficient force the problem of racial discrimination. He excuses the Catholic Church to some extent for refusal to take a militant stand for emancipation, on the ground that "practical wisdom dictated that such a program be temporarily postponed." He refers of course to the circumstances in which the Church found itself in America at that time. W. N. Huggins, *The Contribution of the Catholic Church to the Progress of the Negro in the United States*, 6, 17.

3 Guilday, *History of the Councils of Baltimore*, 81, 167.

4 Guilday, *ibid.*, 162-163; *National Pastorals*, 78, 80-97, 121-124, 142-143, 154.

states were in the majority.⁵ The Pastoral issued by the gathering of 1843 contained what may well have been intended as a condemnation of abolitionism in the admonition to the faithful to practice "fidelity in the fulfillment of all engagements", "obedience to the laws of the nation", and "respect for civil authorities."⁶ The comments on civil allegiance in the Pastoral published in the critical year 1852 were even more pointed:

Attachment to the civil institutions under which you live, has always marked our conduct: and if we address you on this subject, it is not from any apprehension that you are likely to vary from the course which you have hitherto pursued. After the example of the Apostle St. Paul, we cannot, however, deem it altogether unnecessary to exhort you ever to discharge your civil duties from the higher motives which religion suggests. Obey the public authorities, not only for wrath but for conscience sake. Show your attachment to the institutions of our beloved country by prompt compliance with all their requirements, and by the cautious jealousy with which you guard against the least deviation from the rules which they prescribe for the maintenance of public order and private rights. Thus will you refute the babbling of foolish men, and will best approve yourselves worthy of the privileges which you enjoy, and overcome, by the sure test of practical patriotism, all the prejudice which a misapprehension of your principles but too often produces.⁷

Although the bishops in council took no official stand on slavery, individually they, as well as other Catholics, came into the controversy at various times. Thus, the promulgation of Gregory XVI's Letter against the slave trade and an attempt to use that Letter to involve the Catholic Church in a political issue inspired a distinguished member of the hierarchy to clarify the position of his church.⁸

⁵ John England, *Letters to the Honorable John Forsyth on the Subject of Domestic Slavery*, 19.

⁶ Guilday, *op. cit.*, 154.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 192.

⁸ England, *op. cit.*, 19.

Bishop John England presided over a diocese which included North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. From his first accession to the Charleston see he had been rather more aware than some of his fellow bishops of the problems involved in the Americanization of the immigrant Catholic body. It was with this end in view that he had established his diocesan paper in 1822, at a time when the financial state of the diocese scarcely warranted so ambitious an undertaking. In its columns and in his pastorals and sermons he revealed his constant anxiety that Catholics as a group should not be set apart unnecessarily from their fellow citizens.⁹

When Bishop England undertook to clear the Church of the charge of abolitionism, he had already had personal experience with the disastrous effects of such an accusation in a slaveholding community. The forced closing of his school for Negro children and the threatened attack upon his cathedral were still fresh in his mind. At that time another circumstance, too, had served to diminish his hard-earned popularity among the Charleston citizenry—his recent appointment as special legate to arrange a concordat between the papacy and the Negro Republic of Haiti.

Popular disapproval of this appointment, inevitable in a slaveholding community, became apparent at once. When, according to his usual custom, England appeared before the state legislature to explain certain bills in which he was interested, he found himself received with a marked lack of cordiality. It was only after considerable pains that he managed to reinstate himself in the good graces of the legislators and of the community.¹⁰

An open letter, published in the *Charleston Courier*, made clear Bishop England's desire to disassociate the members of

⁹ For England's pastoral letter of August 24, 1831, containing an excellent statement of his ideas of the duties of citizenship, and his desire that Irish-Catholics should adapt themselves quickly to American traditions and customs, see England, *Works*, IV, 303-314.

¹⁰ Guilday, *England*, II, 297; England to Dr. Paul Cullen, *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, VIII, 218-224.

his church from any suspicion of abolitionism. After denying absolutely that he or any other Catholic clergyman had received such literature, he added:

I know no Carolinian who more sincerely deplores, more fully condemns, or more seriously reprobates the conduct of those men, who, by pouring them in upon us, are destroying our peace, and endangering our safety. Nor do I know a single Roman Catholic, clerical or lay, with whom I conversed on the subject, who is not fully determined to use his efforts to prevent the mischief of their interference.¹¹

The Bishop amplified this position in his *Letters to the Honorable John Forsyth on the Subject of Domestic Slavery*, which appeared in his paper, the *United States Catholic Miscellany*, during the fall and winter of 1840-41. The *Letters* were addressed to Forsyth, then Secretary of State, because in a recent campaign speech he had accused Catholics in general and Gregory XVI in particular of aiding and abetting the abolitionist movement.¹² As originally planned the Bishop had intended his reply to consist of three parts: an exposition of the traditional church position, an examination of the revival of slavery in the New World, and an analysis of the condition of the Negro population of the United States. Included in these two latter sections was to be a discussion of the duties of masters and the rights of slaves. Unfortunately death overtook Bishop England when he had completed only the first part of this elaborate rebuttal, and the presentation of the Catholic position remained incomplete.¹³

11 *United States Catholic Miscellany*, Aug. 1, 1835. England attended the public meeting held in Charleston to protest the abolitionist propaganda and to announce a determination to defend southern "constitutional rights" and "their property against all attacks—be the consequences what they may", Guilday, *op. cit.*, II, 156.

12 England, *Letters*, 13-19.

13 J. J. O'Connell. *Catholicity in the Carolinas and Georgia*, 71; *Freeman's Journal*, Jan. 6, 1844, for reprint of an article from the *Catholic Herald* expressing regret that England had been unable to finish and reminding Catholics

In the first *Letter* Bishop England explained the true intent of the pope's recent pronouncement. It applied, he pointed out, not to the domestic system established in the United States but rather to the African slave trade and to the reduction of free persons into slavery. He quoted a corroborating statement to this effect from Gregory himself in private conversation and then recalled the position taken by the southern bishops after the reading of the Apostolic Letter at the Baltimore Council.¹⁴ Had this condemned domestic servitude those bishops would have been forced to refuse the sacraments to all slaveholders unless they manumitted their slaves—a course which obviously had not been adopted.¹⁵

The Bishop next took up the various types of domestic slavery and the traditional attitude of Catholic theologians to the institution. Admitting that slavery had not existed in the original state of nature, he pointed out that from the earliest days of Christianity, theologians had refrained from condemning the system as intrinsically evil or contrary to natural and divine law.¹⁶ Having been established by human legislation as a means of controlling the evil tendencies in man resultant from original sin, it was, provided the slave were justly acquired, lawful.

Then came a survey of the slave codes of the Old Testament, of the attitude of Christ and the Church Fathers, and finally of the position of the Christian Church in the first five or six centuries of its existence.

that in the "just anxiety to remove the suspicion of wishing to disturb established order", they "must neither truckle to infidel philanthropists nor forget the natural dictates of humanity, and the higher inspirations of Religion."

¹⁴ England quoted Gregory's remarks as follows: "Though the southern states of your union have had domestic slavery as an heirloom, whether they would or not, they are not engaged in the Negro traffic." *England, op. cit.*, 21. The domestic slave trade within the United States was apparently not condemned because the Negroes involved were already slaves.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 16-21.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 21-24.

The right of the master, the duty of the slave, the lawfulness of continuing the relations, and the benevolence of religion in mitigating the sufferings of those held in bondage and releasing them by lawful means permitted by the state, are the results exhibited by our view of the laws and facts during the four first centuries of Christianity.¹⁷

Having made a lengthy analysis of ecclesiastical legislation respecting slavery, Bishop England read in these papal and conciliar decrees not only the ameliorating influence of Christianity but also the lawfulness of the institution itself—always provided masters observed the regulations set up to insure to the slave the protection of his human personality and the enjoyment of his rights as a child of God.¹⁸

The England thesis was, in short, that the existence of slavery as a social institution, accepted both by scriptural authority and by the tradition of the Church, was compatible with the exercise of true religion. Admitting the possibility of abuses and confessing his personal aversion to the ownership of one human being by another, he nevertheless approved the indefinite continuance of the "peculiar institution" so long as the treatment of the slaves was governed by Christian principles, "calculated to improve their conditions, and perhaps, in the process of time, to extinguish slavery."¹⁹ It is evident that the triumph of these principles constituted in his opinion the only method by which emancipation could be safely carried out.

Bishop England's argument with its appeal to the scriptures and church teaching resembles that of Protestant clergymen who followed a similar line of reasoning in their attempts to justify the continued existence of slavery.²⁰ Ambiguous and

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 50.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 73-155.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 39.

²⁰ Jenkins, *op. cit.*, 71-73, 200-241; see the argument of Rev. Richard Fuller in Richard Fuller and Francis Wayland, *Domestic Slavery Considered as a Scriptural Institution*. See also J. H. Hammond and J. R. Dew in *The Pro-Slavery Argument*.

inconclusive, the apologia, for all its length, offered no real guidance to American Catholics. The question of the conformance of their institution to "Christian principles" was unanswered. Indeed, in refuting the charge of abolitionism, England went to the opposite extreme and gave ecclesiastical endorsement to slavery.

The Bishop's previous experiences and his confessed dislike of abolitionism perhaps helped to sharpen the proslavery tone of his writing. He himself may have been aware of this for in response to numerous requests for clarification of his stand he inserted in the *Miscellany*, the following statement:

Gentlemen—my more pressing duties will not permit me for some weeks to continue the letters on the compatibility of domestic slavery with practical religion. I have been asked by many a question which I may as well answer at once—viz—whether I am friendly to the existence or continuation of slavery? I am not—but I also see the impossibility of now abolishing it here. When it can and ought to be abolished is a question for the legislature and not for me.²¹

The *Letters* were reprinted in pamphlet form in 1844, several years after Bishop England's death, when an attempt was made once again to bring his church into the slavery controversy. As the issue became more critical they were frequently cited in the Catholic press. Since during the pre-war years no member of the hierarchy directly challenged or amplified the England position, it came to be commonly accepted as expres-

²¹ *U. S. Catholic Miscellany*, Feb. 17, 1841. In 1832 England wrote: "On this question it may be laid down as a maxim that no greater moral evil could be brought upon a country than the introduction of slavery; but it is a very different question, whether in a state which has the misfortune of having been, for a long series of years, under the infliction of such a calamity, an immediate or indiscriminate emancipation would be safe, practicable or beneficial." England, "History of the Diocese of Charleston", *Works*, III, 258.

sive of authoritative Catholic opinion.²² That the *Letters* were regarded in the Charleston diocese as a vindication of the "peculiar system" of the South is apparent from comments in the local press at the time of Bishop England's death.²³ In eulogies from Protestant and Catholic alike, his exertions in behalf of the southern "way of life" received high praise.

When the number of seminaries increased in the United States, ecclesiastical authorities deemed it wise to sponsor the publication of texts which would meet the needs of the American clergy more adequately than those imported from Europe. Among the first of these was the *Theologia Moralis* by Francis Patrick Kenrick, bishop of Philadelphia and later archbishop of Baltimore, one of the most distinguished scholars among the hierarchy.

Bishop Kenrick discussed at some length the moral problems involved in the ownership of slaves. First he reiterated the traditional policy of the Catholic Church:

As all men are by the law of nature equal, no one is by nature master of another; yet by the law of nations not only the dominion of jurisdiction, but also the dominion of property is granted to man over man: and this the old law ratified. (Exod. XXI; Lev. XXV). The Apostles found slavery existing amongst nations and did not condemn it. (Ephes. VI, 5). With those authorities before his eyes, the Church in the Council of Gangas anathemized those who seduced slaves from their owners on a pretext of religion; but as far as it could, favored human liberty, by exhorting masters to manumit their slaves, until slavery having been gradually and in-

22 S. L. Theobald, "Catholic Missionary Work among the Colored People of the U. S.", *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, XXXV, 337-339; *Freeman's Journal*, Aug. 26, 1843, Jan. 6, 1844; *Catholic Herald*, Dec. 14, 1863; *Pilot*, Oct. 17, 1840; *Irish News*, Oct. 25, Nov. 1, 1856.

23 *Charleston Courier*, April 12, 1842, quoted in *U. S. Catholic Miscellany*, April 16, 1842; Speech of A. G. Magrath before the Hibernian Society of Charleston, quoted in *Catholic Advocate*, May 7, 1842.

sensibly abolished, Alexander III, in 1167, forbade Christians to be held as slaves.²⁴

Then, raising the question of servitude in the United States, he

regretted that in the present fullness of liberty in which all glory, there should be so many slaves, and that to guard against their movements, it has been necessary to pass laws prohibiting their education, and in some places greatly restricting their exercise of religion. Nevertheless such is the state of things, nothing should be attempted against the laws, nor anything be done or said that would make them bear their yoke unwillingly. But the prudence and the charity of the sacred ministers should appear in their effecting that the slaves, imbued with Christian morals, render service to their masters, venerating God, the supreme Master of all; and that the masters be just and kind, and by their humanity and care for their salvation, endeavor to mitigate the condition of their slaves. The Apostles have left us these rules; which if anyone should neglect and through a feeling of humanity, endeavor to overturn the entire established order, he would in most cases but aggravate the condition of the slaves.²⁵

This exposition thus established for the clergy in this country a general rule of conduct similar to that adopted by the Catholic Church wherever it came into direct contact with the slave system.²⁶ It was at the same time a conservative statement of the theoretical position of the Church which, like the unfinished

24 F. P. Kenrick, *Theologia Moralis*, I, 255, translated in "The Catholic Church and the Question of Slavery", *The Metropolitan Magazine*, June, 1855, 267.

25 Kenrick, *op. cit.*, I tract V, Cap. VI, translated in *U. S. Catholic Miscellany*, Dec. 9, 1843. Also Kenrick, *op. cit.*, I, 504-505.

26 Cf. Jaime Balmes, *Protestantism and Catholicity Compared*, 90-115, 438, *Leo XIII to the Bishops of Brazil*; Augustin Cochin, *The Results of Slavery*; Rt. Rev. Felix Doupanloup, "Pastoral Letter to his Clergy on the Subject of the Civil War in the U. S.," *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, XXV, 18-29; England, *Letters on Domestic Slavery*.

England *Letters* left to the conscience of the individual clergyman the question whether its practical application was possible under the existent conditions of modern slavery.

Discussions of the slavery controversy appeared also in the religious press. With the expansion of Catholic population such papers had been established in different parts of the country to keep the laity informed of church news and to counteract the outpouring of literature hostile to Catholicism. Edited in some cases by priests, in others by laymen or joint boards, the papers usually carried the endorsement of diocesan authorities. Although largely devoted to problems closely concerned with the Church, they gave sufficient space to secular affairs to throw light on the prevailing tenor of Catholic opinion.

The *U. S. Catholic Miscellany*, organ of the Charleston diocese and the oldest Catholic paper in the country, took from the beginning a firm stand against abolitionism. Nat Tyler's revolt inspired one of its first blasts, an editorial on "Negro Preaching". Pointing to the Virginia insurrection, for which a Negro preacher was reputedly responsible, the writer, (probably England since he was for many years the chief contributor) declared it an "impious burlesque to place an illiterate negro in the station of a preacher." Disclaiming any desire to offer a solution to the slavery question, he concluded with the hope that the South would not "have northern fanatics, emancipationists, abolitionists, let loose upon the plantations."²⁷

A month or so later the *Miscellany* expressed approval of persons in New Haven whose efforts had blocked the foundation of a "black college" in that city. Admitting that there were defects in the slave system, it nevertheless insisted that the lot of the slave in the South was far better than that of the lot of the free black or indigent white in the North. Pointing out that avowed enemies of Catholicism were also active in abolitionist circles, the *Miscellany* suggested that if their interest in the Negro were genuine, the money spent in maligning

²⁷ *U. S. Catholic Miscellany*, Sept. 10, 1831.

the Catholic Church might better be devoted to the colonization movement. In any event, the slaves were "legitimate property" in the South, and an attempt to undermine the institution would be a "flagrant injustice" which might well "sunder the links of social order and national integrity."²⁸

The seizure of a batch of abolitionist pamphlets from the Charleston post office by a group of enraged citizens presented an opportunity for further condemnation of that group in the North "whose interference for some time past has done much to restrict the indulgences granted to our slave population, to abridge the privileges of the free people of colour, and to exasperate the misrepresented and insulted planters and other slaveholders of the South."²⁹

As to the constitutional issue involved in the slavery controversy, editorial opinion maintained

that not only the Federal government but the respective states shall most religiously abstain from any interference direct or indirect with the reserved rights of the individual states: and no right has been more distinctly and unequivocally reserved than that of regulating whether slavery shall continue in any state, and if it shall under what regulations.³⁰

The *Miscellany* was equally jealous of interference by foreigners in the domestic institutions of the states of the Federal Union. Especially was this true when such interference came from antislavery sources in England with whose government Bishop England, like many other Irishmen then resident in the United States, had come in conflict during the early years of his priesthood in Ireland.³¹

That Catholic opinion in the border state of Kentucky was likewise opposed to the abolitionist program is apparent from

28 October 15, 1831. The *Miscellany* in its discussions also linked abolitionism with nativism, e. g., Sept. 12, 1835, June 30, 1838.

29 Aug. 1, 1835.

30 Aug. 22, 1835.

31 Oct. 24, 1835; Oct. 31, 1835.

the attitude of the *Catholic Advocate*, a weekly published in Bardstown by a leading layman, Benjamin J. Webb. The religious argument advanced by the abolitionists was particularly objectionable to the *Advocate* not only because Catholic moralists did not accept as valid the claim that slavery was always and inevitably sinful *per se* but also because of the danger of governmental interference in other matters of more purely religious concern should Congress outlaw the institution on such a basis. This point of view was significant of a very real source of anxiety during the entire slavery controversy. It is suggestive also of the arguments advanced in recent years by Catholics who objected to the Child Labor Amendment and the proposed Federal Department of Education on the grounds that both would enable the national government to interfere with parental and church responsibility for the upbringing of children.³²

In the opening essay of a series entitled "Abolitionists," the editor of the *Advocate* expressed his fears:

I suppose we may call these a sect, though this appears not to be the light in which they are viewed by others. But if peculiar doctrines of a religious nature, constitute a sect, these have full title to the appellation; for their leading tenet is, that to hold slaves "*is a sin against God*". Whatever additional tenets they hold, common to other Christians; in this particular they differ from other Christians, in relation to what is a sin against God; and therefore, may be considered in the light of a *new sect* . . .

. . . But there is one circumstance in their manouevre which seems to have passed unobserved, and which it is of the utmost importance to examine. The circumstance to which I

32 V. A. McQuade, *The Catholic Attitude on Child Labor since 1891*, 65, 74, 79, 86-87, 169; W. D. Guthrie, *The Child Labor Amendment*; Paul S. Blakely, S.J., "The Alleged Child Labor Amendment", *America*, March 10, 1934; W. D. Guthrie, *The Federal Government and Education*; William Cardinal O'Connell, "The Reasonable Limits of State Activity", *Catholic Education Review*, Nov., 1919, 513-527.

allude is this; that this sect are aiming at *political effect*, by *religious motives*. Slaveholders are to be deprived of their property; because the abolitionists think that the *very possession* is a sin against God. This however is to be done by law, and without disorder. But how? By alarming the consciences of men until they can obtain such a condition—sickly condition of society, that it will become necessary to fall into their measures. That is to say, if I mistake not the nature of this enterprise, the abolitionists are troubled *in conscience*, that slavery exists in the United States; and not being able to disburden their consciences in any other way, they seek relief in acts of Congress.—A sect looking up to Congress for a case of conscience! Politicians, have your eyes open! Patriots mind your duty, and save the liberties of your country against these insidious hypocrites!³³

Successive articles repeated the *Miscellany* views as to the impertinence of English interference in American domestic problems, and the right of the southern states to regulate their own institutions.³⁴ When it came to the question of the effect of all this on the Negro, the *Advocate* could see no “blessing to the blacks” in what the American people were willing to offer in the way of freedom. The other alternative, colonization, was ruled out as certain to result in economic disaster to the South.³⁵ “We are not advocates for slavery,” declared the editor at another time, “yet we cannot persuade ourselves that it is, in its very nature, a *heinous* and *crying* sin; much less can we approve of the wild, fanatical, and barbarous schemes of the abolitionists.”³⁶ Bad feeling between Catholics and Presbyterians was particularly strong in the Bardstown diocese and the *Advocate* repeatedly charged the leaders of that denomination with responsibility for the inception and continuance of the

³³ *Catholic Advocate*, April 2, 1836.

³⁴ April 9, 16, 23, 1836.

³⁵ May 7, 1836.

³⁶ Aug. 26, 1837.

abolitionist agitation while boasting that such agitation was absent from Catholic ranks.³⁷

An interesting sidelight upon the way Catholics in Kentucky accepted the workings of the slave system comes from a study of the commercial columns of the *Advocate*. "A likely negro girl," read one notice. Another announced the sale of "12 Negroes," and in a third a reward of \$125 was offered for the return of a runaway.³⁸ Such notices were not uncommon in other issues of the paper.

Editorial opinion in the *Catholic Telegraph*, organ of the Cincinnati diocese, and edited by the brother of its bishop, was more restrained in tone but critical nevertheless of abolitionist activity. Thus, apropos of an anti-abolitionist meeting in Cincinnati, of which the paper approved, there appeared the following comment:

The efforts of the Catholic Church, to meliorate the temporal condition, while she secures the eternal safety of man, are too well known to require that we should here advert to the proof. But Providence is the Queen of Virtues—and even the very cause we would promote may suffer from the neglect of her counsels. The course of the Abolitionists we conceive to be, to say the least of it, very imprudent.³⁹

In 1829 Bishop Benedict Joseph Fenwick of Boston founded in that city a weekly paper which he directed himself for a few years and then transferred to lay management. Published as it was in the very temple of abolitionism, the *Pilot*, as it was finally called after a number of changes of title, was drawn more frequently than other journals into discussions of the various aspects of the slavery question.⁴⁰

37 Aug. 26, 1837; Sept. 9, 1837; Jan. 20, 1838; March 17, 1838.

38 Sept. 22, 1838; Dec. 17, 1836; Dec. 24, 1836; Feb. 18, 1837.

39 *Catholic Telegraph*, Jan. 28, 1836.

40 From 1829-1831 the paper was published as the *Jesuit or Catholic Sentinel*. Successive changes of title thereafter were: 1831-32, *U. S. Catholic Intelligencer*; 1833-34, *Jesuit or Catholic Sentinel*; 1834-35, *Literary and Catholic Sentinel*; 1836-37, *Boston Pilot*; Jan. 1837-April, 1837, *Emerald Isle*; Jan. 1838 to the present, *Boston Pilot*.

An editorial commending the stand taken in New Haven against the proposed establishment of the Negro college, revealed what one must evidently regard as the characteristic Catholic reaction to the budding abolitionist crusade—anxiety over the threat to national unity involved in the “blasted ambition of political aspirants,” fear of the “insurrectionary movements of the swarthy Moors,” and, above all, distrust of “the fanaticism of the Reformation Saints.”⁴¹

On the general issue involved in such discussion the editor wrote:

Slavery, it matters not in what form, or order, has existed in the world ever since the fall of Adam, and what is still more, will continue till the end of time.

We are friends of well regulated freedom, and from our souls detest oppression under any shape or colour. While we are convinced that no human institution is, or can be, exempt from defects, we must, to the credit of our Southern neighbors, say that, although Protestant Britain has fastened the curse of Negro servitude upon them, the slave of the South enjoys more comfort, is often more moral, and certainly more exempt from care, and the temptation to vice, than the free black or indigent white man of the North. Why, if slavery be, as it is, a blot upon the escutcheon of American freedom, did not the Fathers and Founders of our National Constitution, when the Revolution was fought, and gloriously won, immediately wipe it off by their declaration? No, they were convinced of the propriety of leaving that subject undisturbed, and that no injury would fall upon the republic from the coloured population. Negroes were as quiet and orderly as if they were citizens of this new-born country, and would have long continued so, had not fanatical and evil-minded preachers poured in upon them from the non-slaveholding states, and by their wicked cant and disorganizing speeches, frenzied

⁴¹ *U. S. Catholic Intelligencer*, Oct. 1, 1831. Cf. to criticism of abolitionist methods among Protestant clergymen as W. E. Channing, *Slavery*. For speech of William L. Garrison condemning the Christian Churches for uttering no protest against the “sin” of the nation, see Garrison, *op. cit.*, III, 288.

the poor people's minds with gospel liberty, and civil and religious freedom.⁴²

Suggesting that these "philanthropists" of the North should arrange for the purchase and transportation of the slaves to their native land, he continued:

This is practicable; it would be benevolent and wisely calculated at least to retard the awful catastrophe, which, it is to be feared, will one day involve in promiscuous ruin, every condition, colour and sex, and the very liberty, morality and religion of the great American family. The laws of the several slave-holding states identify the Negro slave with property; it is not for us, whether we live in a slave or non-slaveholding state, to discuss the propriety of such identification; but we do say that any attempt direct or indirect, that would tend to alienate property acknowledged as such by law, is tantamount to flagrant injustice, to criminal theft, and evidently calculated to sunder the links of social order and national integrity.⁴³

Due to the fact that hostility to Catholicism on religious and nativist grounds was strong in Massachusetts when the Garrisonian movement was in its early stages, a defensive position was very frequent in the *Pilot*. Abolitionist activity was condemned as dangerous to the peace and security of the country, but the most vehement criticism was reserved for the Protestant sects which gave it their support and for the "itinerant Gospelers" who were accused of combining with their abolitionism an equally intense hatred of Catholicism.⁴⁴

In 1838, Patrick Donohue became editor of the paper, a position which he occupied throughout the pre-war period and for many years thereafter. Donohue distinguished more sharply between abolitionism and antislavery sentiments than did his

⁴² *U. S. Catholic Intelligencer*, Oct. 1, 1831.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ *U. S. Catholic Intelligencer*, Oct. 8, Oct. 29, 1831; Feb. 10, 1832; *Pilot*, May 7, 1836, Dec. 1, 1838.

southern and border state colleagues, and he made it clear that opposition to the former by no means implied in his mind a positive support of the slave system. In an editorial headed "Abolitionism and 'Popery'," he declared:

We have a society formed for the purpose of abolishing slavery; and we trust none of our readers will deny that slavery ought to be immediately abolished. When, therefore, we look at these societies as enemies of slavery, we must applaud them without reserve.

But the inquiry does not stop here. Their object is to abolish slavery by certain means. We must then inquire what are these means? The Constitution of the Anti-slavery society is, in our opinion, unexceptionable. It provides that all men, of all sorts, parties and complexions—be their creed whatever it may—and who are in favor of immediate emancipation, shall have a seat in the conventions and belong to the society.

Judging, therefore, of these anti-slavery principles, we pronounce them good. Everything appears right. Here is no room for imperfection or inconsistency.⁴⁵

The conduct of the members and the application which they made of this constitution, Donohoe regarded as something quite different. It was upon these grounds that he warned Catholics to avoid even the slightest cooperation with them:

It is as might have been expected. These societies are thronged with bigotted and persecuting religionists; with men who, in their private capacity, desire the extermination of Catholics by fire and sword. Is it to be supposed that these men will adhere to the terms of their constitution, when convened with their brethren at the large anniversaries, and carefully respect the consciences of all sects? ⁴⁶

In most of the northern states the extinction of slavery came about as the result of legislation providing for gradual eman-

⁴⁵ September 23, 1839.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

cipation.⁴⁷ This was true in New York where, after certain preliminary measures, an act of 1817 set July 4, 1827 as the date for the emancipation of all remaining slaves.⁴⁸ In an editorial setting forth his views as to the way in which emancipation might be safely carried out, Donohoe praised the procedure adopted by the neighboring state:

That day arrived, and the odious system of slavery was abolished forever, without tumult or bloodshed. The state of New York thus set to the other states of the Union the example of granting to man his great prerogative of equal rights and justice, no matter what may be his colour or his creed.⁴⁹

The Catholic press as well as certain of the spiritual leaders of the Church was drawn further into the sectional issue when Daniel O'Connell, the Irish leader, gave his support to the British antislavery movement. By far the greater proportion of Catholic immigrants who entered the United States in the thirties and early forties came from Ireland and their bonds with the mother country remained close. The hardships which the Irish people were undergoing as a result of famine, tenant-landlord difficulties, and the long struggle for repeal of the Act of Union were constantly before the minds of Irishmen in their new home while the "Great Liberator" was worshipped among them as he was in Ireland. Everywhere the Irish settled in any number, Repeal societies were organized to advance the cause of Irish freedom. Financial contributions from these *émigrés* were substantial and became an important source of revenue to the Repeal movement.

Eager as they were for O'Connell to succeed in his efforts on behalf of Ireland, they reacted quite differently to his attempts to persuade his fellow countrymen in the United States to support the abolitionist movement. O'Connell, no doubt actu-

47 U. B. Phillips, *American Negro Slavery*, 120.

48 *Ibid.*, 120.

49 May 7, 1836.

ated by a constitutional sympathy for the "under dog" everywhere, took part in the antislavery agitation in England which brought about emancipation in the British West Indies. Through these activities he came into contact with American abolitionists who from time to time participated in antislavery conventions in England.

He was a frequent and popular speaker at their meetings and he did not hesitate then, or in other public utterances, to vent the full force of his oratorical powers upon the American slaveholders and their institution.⁵⁰ "It is a loathsome and execrable system," he asserted on one such occasion, "that makes man the property of his fellow—it is buying and selling man created after the image of God, redeemed by the blood of His Son, and bearing upon his brow the impress of the Eternal seal . . ." ⁵¹ At another time, taking up the cudgels against the Colonization Society, he referred to it as a "humbug," "the most ludicrous society that ever was dreamed of." ⁵²

All this was calculated to lacerate Américan feelings—ever sensitive to foreign criticism—and to probe southern sensibilities to the quick. But when O'Connell went further and issued a direct appeal to his compatriots in America to devote themselves to the cause of immediate emancipation, he stirred up a veritable hornet's nest. The first of these came in the form of a petition which O'Connell, Father Theobald Mathew, the temperance crusader, and numerous other Irishmen addressed

⁵⁰ Garrison, *op. cit.*, I, 376-377, II, 367, 382; F. E. Wayland, "Slave Breeding in America: the Stevenson-O'Connell Imbroglia", *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, Jan., 1942, 447-454; *Catholic Herald*, Jan. 18, 1838; *Freeman's Journal*, Sept. 23, 1843.

⁵¹ *Pilot*, May 3, 1845.

⁵² Garrison, *op. cit.*, I, 376-377. Abolitionists were inclined to oppose colonization as a palliative promoted by proslavery interests. See E. S. Fox, *The American Colonization Society*, 84-106, 125-179; Avery Craven, *The Coming of the Civil War*, 119. Southerners who hoped for the eventual disappearance of slavery, for a time supported the colonization movement as a means of solving the race problem and increasing the number of manumissions. *Ibid.*, 118-119.

to their fellow countrymen in the United States.⁵³ The storm of criticism which this aroused in the Irish press here, the condemnatory resolutions which were sent across the water from the Repeal societies, and protests from some of O'Connell's American friends, induced the Liberator to modify his position to the extent of disclaiming any affiliation with American abolitionists, though he repeated his denunciation of the system by which the Negro was held as "chattel property."⁵⁴

This was small comfort to Irish-Americans, especially since O'Connell continued his attacks upon slavery, and in an *Address to the Cincinnati Irish Repeal Association* repeated more strongly than ever his pleas to "come out of the councils of the iniquitous, and out of the congregation of the wicked." Expressing his regret that the Irish were among the worst enemies of the colored race in the United States, he called upon them to give their unlimited support to efforts being made here to improve the condition of the freedmen and to hasten the abolition of the slave system, and concluded with a final burst of characteristic fervor:

We conjure you, Irishmen and descendants of Irishmen, to abandon forever all defence of the more hideous negro-slavery system. Let it no more be said that your feelings are made so obtuse by the air of America, that you cannot feel, as Catholics and Christians ought to feel, this truth—this plain truth—that one man can not have any property in another man.

Once again, and for the last time, *We call upon you to come out of the councils of the slaveholders, and at all events, to free yourselves from participation in their guilt.*

Irishmen! I call on you to join in crushing slavery, and in giving liberty to every man of every caste, creed, and color.⁵⁵

⁵³ Garrison, *op. cit.*, III, 43-45; *Freeman's Journal*, March 15, 1842.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, Sept. 23, 1843.

⁵⁵ *Freeman's Journal*, Dec. 5, 1863; also extracts in *The Pope's Bull and the Words of Daniel O'Connell*, a campaign pamphlet issued to win Irish-Catholic support for Fremont in the election of 1856.

Judging from the discussion in the Catholic papers most of which devoted considerable space to Irish affairs, from the action of local Repeal societies, and from the stand taken by members of the hierarchy, like Hughes of New York, or England of Charleston, Irish opinion was deeply resentful of these attempts to influence their political and social views.⁵⁶ Irishmen resident in the South were especially outraged. As a result, a number of Repeal societies were disbanded, and there was a marked falling off in the contributions which they had been accustomed to send to Ireland.⁵⁷

Northern opinion was critical also, though more restrained in tone. In the *Pilot* for example, repudiation of the intemperance of O'Connell's attack and his interference in a purely domestic affair was qualified by favorable comment upon his anti-slavery views in the abstract.⁵⁸

The reasons for this reaction were several. A primary consideration was undoubtedly, the desire to avoid any action which might lay the recently arrived immigrants open to the charge of foreign dictation. At a period when nativist and religious prejudice was rampant, such a suspicion would be bound to increase the difficulties which the Catholic population was undergoing. Typical of this point of view was the statement issued by Bishop Hughes, calling upon naturalized Irishmen to repudiate the O'Connell-Mathew *Appeal*

not because of the doctrines it contains, but because of their having emanated from a foreign source, and of their tendency

⁵⁶ England, *op. cit.*, 14-15; Hassard, *op. cit.*, 216; *Freeman's Journal*, Feb. 16, 23, 1842, March 5, 1842, July 22, 1843, Sept. 13, 1845; *Pilot*, May 7, 1836, Feb. 5, 1842, Nov. 18, 1843; *Catholic Advocate*, March 17, 1838; *U. S. Catholic Miscellany*, Oct. 6, 1838, Jan. 16, 1841; John Hughes, "Lecture on Life and Times of Daniel O'Connell," *Freeman's Journal*, June 21, 1856; Orestes Brownson, *Works*, XV, 573-584.

⁵⁷ *Pilot*, July 8, 1843, Jan. 20, 1844, June 14, 1845; *Catholic Advocate*, May 7, 1842.

⁵⁸ *Pilot*, Aug. 1, 1840; *Freeman's Journal*, July 15, 1843; *Catholic Telegraph*, Feb. 19, 1842.

to operate on questions of domestic and national policy. I am no friend of slavery, but I am still less friendly to any attempt of *foreign origin* to abolish it.

The duties of naturalized Irishmen or others, I consider to be in no wise distinct or different from those of native born Americans. And if it be proved an attempt has been made by this address or any address to single them out on any question appertaining to the foreign or domestic policy of the United States, in any other capacity than that of the whole population then it will be their duty to their country and their conscience, to rebuke such an attempt come from what foreign source it may, in the most decided manner and language that common courtesy will permit.⁵⁹

Scarcely less potent an influence was the Irishman's congenital dislike of England and of anything which emanated from her shores. Over and over again, in the course of the controversy with O'Connell, the warning was repeated to beware of British propagandists who under the guise of humanitarianism were seeking the disruption of American unity.⁶⁰

The tendency of the naturalized Irishman to give his allegiance to the Democratic Party and his fear of Negro competition were no doubt contributing factors to his dislike of abolitionism. This was certainly true at a later period when emancipation became a probability and then a *fait accompli*. Equally important in fostering this antipathy in the earlier years was the fact that some of the leading protagonists of abolitionism were active in attacking not only Catholicism but also cherished concepts of organized Christianity in general.⁶¹ An editorial in the *Freeman's Journal* contained a typical expression of this attitude. Rebuking O'Connell for his support

⁵⁹ *Freeman's Journal*, March 12, 1842. See also *U. S. Catholic Miscellany*, March 12, April 2, 1842; *Pilot*, Feb. 5, 12, 19, 1842; *Freeman's Journal*, March 5, 1842. For Garrisonian disappointment at failure to win Irish support, see Garrison, *op. cit.*, III, 43-45, 50-51.

⁶⁰ *Catholic Advocate*, Apr. 16, 1836; *Freeman's Journal*, May 17, 1845; *Pilot*, Jan. 8, 1842, Feb. 12, 1842, Oct. 4, 1845.

⁶¹ *Pilot*, Nov. 18, 1843.

of the abolitionist cause, the editor asserted that the majority of Garrisonians were "skeptics in religion," "Deists, Atheists, Pantheists, anything but Christians."⁶²

Thus, in spite of the desire of ecclesiastical authorities to keep the Catholic Church free of embroilment in political problems, force of circumstance and individual inclination brought members of their faith into the slavery issue. While representative opinion, both North and South, admitted that human bondage was by no means an ideal system, sectional interests encouraged—and Catholic doctrine permitted—differences in its judgment as to the gravity of the evil and the wisdom or practicability of proposals for remedying or removing it. Upon one aspect of the question even in these early years, there was a fairly unanimous agreement—namely that the principles and methods of Garrisonian abolitionism were not only a threat to the safety of the country but also in conflict with Catholic ethics and ideals.

⁶² *Freeman's Journal*, July 15, 1843.

CHAPTER V

THE CASE AGAINST ABOLITIONISM

JOHN C. CALHOUN, enumerating in the course of his final Senatorial oration the various bonds which served to bind together the separate states of the Federal Union, pointed to the "unity of the great religious denominations" as the "strongest of those of a spiritual and ecclesiastical nature." He then went on to describe how even the churches, the very bulwarks of Christian society had been unable to "resist the explosive effect of slavery agitation."¹ Developments within three of the four leading Protestant denominations during the pre-war years substantiated Calhoun's observations. As the antislavery movement gained strength in the 1830's discussion over this issue had taken on an increasing importance and members of the clergy appeared before the public as conspicuous protagonists on both sides. In spite of efforts of the more conservative leaders to keep aloof from the controversy, disagreement over some aspect of the question split in turn the Methodists, the Baptists, and the Presbyterians.² Even among churches which, like the Lutheran, had less direct contact with the institution itself or lacked the same national organization there was considerable discussion and at least theoretical division.³ The Episcopalians alone refrained from such public discussions in their conventions. After the establishment of the Confederacy southern members of that church set up an independent organization, but the General Conventions held in 1863 and 1865 refused to rec-

1 J. C. Calhoun, *Works*, IV, 557-558.

2 W. W. Sweet, *The Story of Religions in America*, 6-7, 412-427; C. B. Swaney, *Episcopal Methodism and Slavery*; George Peck, *Slavery and the Episcopacy*; W. W. Sweet, *The Presbyterians*, 111-112; R. E. Thompson, *A History of the Presbyterian Churches in the United States*, 133-157; W. W. Sweet, *The Baptists*, 99-101; A. H. Newman, *A History of the Baptist Churches in the United States*, 444-445.

3 T. C. Blegen, *Norwegian Migration to America*, II, 418-453; W. W. Sweet, *The Congregationalists*, 29, 157, 177-178, 270-272.

ognize this secession and included the bishops of the South in the roll calls. In consequence with the end of the war restoration of unity was a simple matter.⁴

Within the Northern denominations which permitted such controversy antislavery sentiment increased as the crisis approached. Determined efforts were made in state assemblies and local societies to bring about a definite abolitionist alignment and a specific attack upon the slave system as contrary to the law of God and the Christian tradition.⁵ Opposed to these antislavery radicals, however, were some few apologists for slavery who supported the southern defense on the grounds of Biblical justification.⁶ Between the two extremes was a middle of the road group, comprising probably the majority of the church leaders, which supported a more moderate position. Like Francis Wayland and others of a conservative persuasion, they regarded slavery as unchristian and contrary to every concept of the natural dignity of man but they held, nevertheless, that the guilt of the slave owner was modified by his own understanding of his duty and by the laws of the community in which he lived. According to this school of thought, the slavery problem was one to be settled by the slaveholders themselves. In any event, both wisdom and justice dictated the adoption of some form of gradual emancipation.⁷

4 Sweet, *The Story of Religions in America*, 454-455.

5 B. F. Wright, *American Interpretations of the Natural Law*, 172-174; Gilbert Barnes, *The Antislavery Impulse*; A. D. Mayo, *Herod, John and Jesus: or American Slavery and its Christian Cure*; J. P. Thompson, *Teachings of the New Testament on Slavery*; Theodore Parker, *The Slave Power*. For a discussion of this radical antislavery clergyman, see H. S. Commager, *Theodore Parker*, especially the chapter on "Slavery and the Higher Law", 197-213.

6 A. Y. Lloyd, *The Slavery Controversy*, 168-169; Elijah Hedding, *Substance of an Address... on the Principles and History of said Church (Methodist) on the Act of Holding Slaves*; Rabbi M. J. Raphael, *Bible View of Slavery*; A. A. Lyons, "Religious Defense of Slavery in the North", *Historical Papers of Trinity College Historical Society*, XIII, 20-33.

7 Richard Fuller and Francis Wayland, *Domestic Slavery Considered as a Scriptural Institution*; Peck, *op. cit.* Cf. the position of William Ellery Channing in the earlier years of abolitionism. W. E. Channing, *Slavery*.

While many churchmen in the North continued to oppose Garrisonian immediacy and some accepted the scriptural justification advanced by their southern brethren, there were in the South during the pre-war decades but a handful of outspoken anti-slavery clergymen.⁸ Leaders of organized Protestant Christianity joined in the defense of slavery which developed in the 1820's and they came to take an active part in the counter-offensive against the abolitionist assault.⁹ Turning to the literal interpretation of the Scriptures to defend the continued existence of the slave system, they became in consequence increasingly rigid in their adherence to the text of the Bible.

Many of them, it is true, inclined to the position of Richard Fuller who, while he made use of the Old and New Testaments to refute the abolitionist claim that slavery was a moral evil and a crime in the sight of God, expressed his regret that human beings should be held in bondage and looked to Christianity to effect eventual emancipation.¹⁰ Regarding the slave state as a kind of tutelage which was preparing the Negro for possible freedom at some distant date, they accepted the obligation of mitigating its hardships by instructing both masters and slaves in their respective duties. Although they insisted that the

8 Virginius Dabney, *Liberalism in the South*, 117. Before 1830 there was considerable support for emancipation among evangelical church members of the old South. The assault of northern extremists together with the fear of servile revolt helped to discourage such sentiment and it lost its force. Avery Craven, *The Coming of the Civil War*, 119-121. Southern Quakers, especially in North Carolina, were, like their fellows in the North, opposed to slavery. By 1787 regulations of yearly meetings in Virginia, Maryland, and North Carolina, directed members to free their slaves under penalty of exclusion from the Society. The difficulty of fulfilling this order resulted in the migration of many Quakers to Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. In North Carolina, the Quakers were active in developing plans to facilitate manumissions, in aiding freedmen to leave the state, and in educational works among the free Negroes. Sweet, *The Story of Religions in America*, 417-418. J. S. Bassett, *Slavery in the State of North Carolina*, 29, 32, 64-71.

9 Craven, *op. cit.*, 156-158, 163-164; "Hammond's Letters on Slavery", *Pro-Slavery Argument*, 105-109, 155-159. W. J. Jenkins, *Pro-Slavery Thought in the Old South*, 200-241. W. E. Dodd, *The Cotton Kingdom*, 97-117.

10 Jenkins, *op. cit.*, 216-218; Fuller-Wayland, *op. cit.*

churches had no commission to interfere with the established order, they fostered programs for carrying the Gospel to the slaves with the result that in the decade or so before the war considerable missionary activity was carried on among the slave population.¹¹

Others, more radical in their proslavery thought, insisted that the institution was a positive good, that it was God's method of rescuing the "degraded African" from the "debasing effects of generations of sin."¹² Slavery had existed, held such defenders of the "peculiar institution," from the "first organization of society."¹³ It could cease only when the design of Christianity, which was to "secure the perfection of the race," had been attained.¹⁴ Since there was no prospect of attaining this perfection short of the millennium complete liberation would be possible only in heaven. In the latter years of the controversy such expressions of belief in the "divine appointment of domestic servitude," in the "peculiar mission of the Southern Churches to conserve the institution" were more frequent in the proceedings of local and regional denominational assemblies and in the utterances of outspoken clerical apologists.¹⁵

Throughout the entire period Catholic hierarchical leaders adhered in their national councils to their policy of silence on the critical issue of slavery. In this they resembled the leaders of the Protestant Episcopal Church who likewise avoided bitterness and public dispute in their General Conventions. When in 1852 the Catholic bishops and archbishops of the country met

11 Jenkins, *op. cit.*, 208-215; Luther Jackson, "Religious Instruction of Negroes, 1830-1860 with Special Reference to South Carolina", *Journal of Negro History*, XV, 72-114.

12 Lloyd, *op. cit.*, 183.

13 Parson Brownlow, quoted in Jenkins, *op. cit.*, 216.

14 Dr. James H. Thornwell, quoted in *ibid.*, 216-217.

15 Quoted from the Southern Presbyterian Conference of 1863 in Dabney, *op. cit.*, 118. Quotations from Dr. Benjamin Palmer of New Orleans and from Dr. J. H. Thornwell in *ibid.*, 118. See also *Church Action on Slavery*; Lloyd, *op. cit.*, 166-193; Swaney, *op. cit.*, 246-275.

at Baltimore for the first Plenary Council to be held in the United States, which was also the final national assemblage of the pre-war period, no sign of sectional strife was permitted to mar the harmony of the public proceedings.¹⁶ It is possible, nevertheless, to trace through other agencies the emergence of what may be reasonably designated as the "Catholic point of view."

In one important respect there was a continued sectional agreement. From the very early stages of the movement Catholics had been united in their opposition to radical abolitionism with its program of immediate emancipation without preparing the slaves for such a change in their status or compensating their owners for loss of property. A number of influences contributed to this attitude.

However much Catholics might differ in regard to slavery when considered as a social or political problem the theological position of the Church which denied that slavery was an evil *per se* was beyond question. Both the scriptural and church tradition were interpreted as recognizing that its existence with certain qualifying conditions was compatible with the practice of religion. Consequently, the Garrisonian plea for the immediate and unconditional eradication of human bondage was rejected in the North as in the South.¹⁷

These were years of revolutionary upheavals in Europe which were frequently characterized by anti-clericalism and hostility to religion in general and the Catholic Church in particular. There were repercussions of this in the United States where people saw in the European revolutions the counterpart of the American struggle for independence and democracy and gave them their support and sympathy. Thus, when the Hungarian revolutionary, Louis Kossuth, visited this country he received,

¹⁶ Peter Guilday, *History of the Councils of Baltimore*, 169-170.

¹⁷ "The Catholic Church and the Question of Slavery", *Metropolitan Magazine*, June, 1855, 267. See also Orestes Brownson, "Slavery and the Mexican War", *Works*, XVI, 27-28; John Hughes, "Sermon of April 30, 1854", *Works*, II, 219-223.

at least during the first weeks of his stay, a most enthusiastic welcome.¹⁸

Catholic spokesmen regarded such emissaries as "Red Republicans" who, intent on the destruction of the social order, of public morality, and of religion, were sponsoring "atheism in politics, in science, and in literature."¹⁹ They professed to see an already established link between radicals in this country and in Europe—and they pointed to the welcome accorded Kossuth in reform circles as proof of their contention.²⁰

So lively was the concern lest European radicalism gain a foothold in the United States that considerable support developed among Catholics for the proposed extension of the residence requirement for naturalization and restriction of immigration.²¹ Louisiana Creoles joined the American Party, partly perhaps because of their interest in the protection of their slave property, but influenced also by the dread spectre of "socialism."²² In New Orleans a priest, one Father Adrian Roquette wrote, under the pseudonym of "Mucius," two pamphlets in defense of the "magnificent national party who can alone save the Republic, who can alone save us from demagoguery and dismemberment of the Union and from the aberration of social-

18 J. B. McMaster, *History of the American People*, VIII, 143-157. Kossuth's demands for American intervention in Europe and his financial importunities alienated much of this support and he left the country more or less discredited. *Ibid.*, 154-157.

19 *Pittsburgh Catholic*, May 31, 1851.

20 *Pilot*, Oct. 25, 1851; R. A. Billington, *The Protestant Crusade*, 330-334. Billington notes the tendency of Protestant clergy and laity to regard Kossuth as a symbol of Protestantism. The open opposition of Catholic leaders to Kossuth encouraged this tendency. *Ibid.*, 331; *Pilot*, Dec. 20, 1851.

21 Expressions of this dislike of European "radicalism" may be found in *St. Louis Leader*, Apr. 25, 1855 and May 12, 1855; *Freeman's Journal*, Jan. 5, 1850, Mar. 25, 1855, May 12, 1855; *Catholic Herald and Visitor*, Feb. 11, 1860; *Pittsburgh Catholic*, Dec. 22, 1849; Brownson, "The Fugitive Slave Law", *op. cit.*, 17-39.

22 W. D. Overdyke, "History of the American Party in Louisiana", *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, XV, 88, 261-262, 273-277.

ism . . ."²³ And a paper so devoted to the interest of a portion of the foreign born population as the Boston *Pilot* gave editorial support to reform of the naturalization procedure in the hope of disfranchising the German revolutionaries.²⁴

In the United States this was a period of renewed hostility to Catholicism and to immigrants, a large proportion of whom were members of the Roman Church. The early and mid-forties, which witnessed the New York school controversy, riots in Philadelphia and other centers of foreign population, and the emergence of the Native American Party as a factor in state and national politics, were followed by a period of comparative quiescence in the "Protestant Crusade."²⁵ New issues such as the Mexican War, the Oregon boundary dispute, and the question of slavery in the territories, served to distract public attention from its concern with popery and the immigrant.²⁶

The decade of the fifties, however, brought a vigorous revival of Protestant nativism and the Catholic Church was once more on the defensive against a political organization, the Know-Nothings.²⁷ European anti-clericalism and nativist anti-Popery came together in the spring of 1853 when Archbishop Gaetano Bedini was sent as papal delegate to settle trusteeism difficulties in Philadelphia and New York.²⁸ His purpose accomplished, the nuncio embarked on a tour of the leading American cities. Disturbances, inspired frequently by immigrants, who resented

23 Quoted from "La Question Américaine", pt. II, 27 in *ibid.*, XVI, 271.

24 *Pilot*, June 24, 1854; Brownson, *op. cit.*, XVIII, "Native Americans", 281-300; "The Know-Nothings", 300-380. Brownson saw franchise restriction as necessary to protect American institutions and he urged foreign born Catholics to accept disfranchisement so long as there was no discrimination against Catholics as such. See also *St. Louis Leader*, Dec. 27, 1856.

25 Billington, *op. cit.*, 193-238.

26 *Ibid.*, 238.

27 *Ibid.*, 380-430.

28 *Ibid.*, 300-304; J. G. Shea, *History of the Catholic Church in the U. S.*, IV, 358-365, 436, 463.

the role Bedini was reputed to have played in the Revolutions of 1848, but supported by nativist mobs as well, accompanied his appearance almost everywhere. The most serious of these occurred in Cincinnati where the German radical group was strong.

As part of the Know-Nothing campaign Catholics were subject to attack from both sides for their position, real or assumed, on the slavery question.²⁹ It is true that the appeal of Know-Nothingism in the South resulted mainly from fear that continued immigration would further increase the balance of power against that section and from distrust of the antislavery propensities of foreigners. No-Popery was, nevertheless, a contributing factor especially in more isolated communities and Catholics like other foreigners were accused of abolitionism.³⁰ In the North, on the other hand, the generally accepted feeling that Catholic immigrants, especially those of Irish stock, were tainted with a proslavery bias furnished nativist leaders with political ammunition.³¹

Placed thus upon the defensive and beset by the ever present fears of European "Socialism," Catholic spokesmen tended to portray their Church as a conservative, law-abiding, unifying

29 Billington, *op. cit.*, 386-387, 392-394, 423-430; A. C. Cole, "Nativism in the Lower Mississippi Valley", *Mississippi Valley Historical Association Proceedings*, VI, 258-275; G. M. Stephenson, "Nativism in the Forties and Fifties with Special Reference to the Mississippi Valley", *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, IX, 185-202; L. F. Schmeckebier, *History of the Know-Nothing Party in Maryland* (*Johns Hopkins Studies in Historical and Political Science*, XVII).

30 Billington, *op. cit.*, 392-394. For the Catholic reaction to Know-Nothingism and the charge of abolitionism see *Letter of an Adopted Catholic... on Temporal Allegiance to the Pope and the Relation of the Catholic Church and Catholics both Native and Adopted, to the System of Domestic Slavery and Its Agitation in the United States*. See also *Catholic Mirror*, April 22, 1853.

31 Billington, *op. cit.*, 396-397, 425; W. G. Bean, "An Aspect of Know-Nothingism—the Immigrant and Slavery", *South Atlantic Quarterly*, XXIII, 319-334. Bean sees this "feeling" as more important than the real attitude of the immigrant. For an example of the propaganda used to appeal to the Catholic immigrant vote, see *The Pope's Bull and Daniel O'Connor*.

influence which would leave the settlement of the slavery question to the legally constituted authorities of the country. This point of view received the stamp of official approval from time to time in pastoral letters and various other hierarchical pronouncements, as for example, the following extract from a message to the clergy and laity of the archdiocese of Cincinnati:

The spirit of the Catholic Church is eminently conservative, and while her ministers rightfully feel a deep and abiding interest in all that concerns the welfare of the country, they do not think it their province to enter the political arena. They leave to the ministers of the human sects to discuss from their pulpits and in their ecclesiastical assemblies the very exciting questions which lie at the base of our present and prospective difficulties. Thus, while many of the sects have divided into hostile parties on an exciting political issue, the Catholic Church has carefully preserved her unity of spirit in the bond of peace, literally knowing no North, no South, no East, and no West.³²

The Catholic press, alert to discharge its function as defender of the faith, pointed up the wisdom and patriotism of this course as contrasted with that of other religious bodies. The Fugitive Slave disorders, the struggle over Kansas, John Brown's raid,

³² Third Pastoral of the Province of Cincinnati, *The Guardian*, May 18, 1861; Pastoral of the 9th Provincial Council of Baltimore, *Freeman's Journal*, May 29, 1858; Bishop Verot, "Sermon," *ibid.*, June 18, 1864; M. J. Spalding, *Miscellanea*, lvii; Bishop O'Connor, "The Influence of the Catholic Church on the Civil Institutions of the Country", *Pittsburgh Catholic*, March 27, 1852. See also the Pastoral of the Third Provincial Council of New Orleans, *Catholic Mirror*, March 1, 1856; Pastoral of the Provincial Council of St. Louis, 1855, *ibid.*, Nov. 3, 1855. Father Daniel Moore of Rochester, New York, in a letter to the editor of the *Rochester Democrat* denied that Catholics were favorable to slavery but he stated that, as American citizens who had sworn allegiance to the Constitution, they stood on "middle ground" between "attacking the vested rights of American citizens and standing sponsor to slavery or desiring to prolong the groans of an afflicted people". From this position they could "aid in every legitimate manner" the peaceful abolition of the southern system while at the same time upholding the Union. Quoted in F. J. Zwierlein, *The Life and Letters of Bishop McQuaid*, I, 261-264.

and other instances of violence in the turbulent years before the war, each in turn became an occasion for reiteration of the "truly Christian and conservative" policy of the Church and the loyalty of her members.³³ It was impossible for naturalized Americans to join the party of the "Black Republicans" the editor of the *Pilot* explained, for

that party is hostile to the Constitution, so far as it provided for the protection of the rights of the South. Naturalized citizens, with a full and clear understanding of the obligation incurred, have sworn to support the Constitution; and we venture to say that not one of them has taken the oath without an express intention to be faithful to it, according to the letter and the spirit. They all understand the question raised by the freesoilers, now named Black Republicans, and they all know, that the position taken by that party is in direct conflict with the Constitution.³⁴

This was all the more true, he concluded, if the adopted citizen were a "sound Catholic."

The *Freeman's Journal* of New York, completing a series of editorials in which the Catholic population was described as the one hope of the nation and of the ultimate interests of the South, declared that:

On the question of slavery, Catholics alone are agreed at the North and at the South; and this is not the result of any labored attempts to enforce unanimity—it is spontaneous. Right views commend themselves naturally to the minds of men who receive the universal teaching on this subject, and who do not allow themselves to be led astray by abstract

³³ *Catholic Mirror*, Nov. 21, 1857. Also *ibid.*, Feb. 22, May 10, 1851, June 14, 1856; *St. Louis Leader*, Nov. 10, April 7, 1855; *Pittsburgh Catholic*, June 28, 1856, Oct. 29, 1859; *Pilot*, Jan. 3, 1852, June 17, 1854, March 21, 28, 1857; *Freeman's Journal*, Jan. 5, 1850; Nov. 24, 1855, Jan. 5, Feb. 9, 1856; *Catholic Telegraph*, Dec. 3, 1862.

³⁴ *Pilot*, May 31, 1856.

disquisitions, or hearken to the voice of self-elected expounders of the Divine Law, as they understand it.³⁵

The consensus of lay opinion took much the same form whether it came from political leaders, lawyers or philosophizing magazine editors. Thus, Congressman John Kelly of New York in a speech from the floor of the House told the members of Congress that Fourierism and the various other manifestations of socialism originated not among immigrants, Catholic or Protestant, but rather in New England, the "special nursery for all these projects for reorganizing society."³⁶ Taking up the cudgels for his fellow Irishmen and co-supporters of the Democratic Party, Kelly continued:

The Catholics of the United States have ever shown themselves faithful to this their country, ready to take their share of the public burden in peace or war—lovers of the Union—neither Abolitionists nor fanatics: but impressed with a sense of responsibility to a higher power which has commanded them to "give unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's" and who will demand a vigorous account of our exercise of political power as of any other placed in our hands.³⁷

Such sentiments found echo both North and South as zealous sons of the church waged their war on a "double though a common enemy—the purely Know-Nothing Party on the one hand, and the Black Republican or Abolition Party on the other."³⁸

³⁵ *Freeman's Journal*, Feb. 9, 1856.

³⁶ John Kelly, *Speech Delivered in the House of Representatives on Tuesday, Feb. 10, 1857*, 19.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 22. John Kelly was the only Catholic Congressman in the 34th Congress. J. F. McLaughlin, *The Life and Times of John Kelly*, 175.

³⁸ *Letter of an Adopted Catholic*, *op. cit.*, I. See also Charles O'Connor, *Negro Slavery Not Unjust*, 8-10; J. M. Gallagher, "Speech of May 14, 1857", *Pittsburgh Catholic*, May 30, 1857; Brownson, "The Church and the Republic", *Pilot*, March 1, 1856; "Dr. Brownson and the Supreme Court of the United States", *Metropolitan Magazine*, May, 1857, 214.

These were years, too, when reform was rampant in the United States, when crusaders were suggesting a dozen different cure-alls for human ills, when Utopia seemed just around the corner. The perfectionist ideal was of itself contrary to Catholic social theory which recognized neither the possibility of reaching a "Golden Age" in this world nor the effectiveness of any purely human instruments in reforming mankind.³⁹ As Orestes Brownson, who despite, or possibly because of, his frequent quarrels with his fellow religionists, was a most effective expositor of Catholic doctrine, wrote in explanation of this principle:

To a greater or less extent we must tolerate sin, not in ourselves assuredly, but in others, and bear with transgressors, even as God bears with them. We must respect their free will, leave them the responsibility of their own misdeeds, because this is what God himself does, and because to attempt to root out all sins by violence, whether physical or social, for there is a social as well as a physical violence, would in the end only render matters infinitely worse, by destroying virtue itself. We cannot make this world a paradise, and all its inhabitants saints, as foolish Puritans dream. As long as man retains free will, there will be abuses, there will be wrongs and outrages, and the sooner we come to this conclusion, and conform ourselves to it, the better will it be for all concerned, and the more real progress will be made in virtue.⁴⁰

While preaching the equality of all men before God as possessors of eternal souls, Catholic social theorists have accepted

³⁹ *Pilot*, Oct. 22, 1842, Apr. 3, 1852; *Catholic Telegraph*, Dec. 3, 1862; *Freeman's Journal*, Nov. 24, 1855; Sermon by Father M. Roddan in *Pittsburgh Catholic*, May 31, 1851; *Catholic Mirror*, Mar. 4, 1854; *U. S. Catholic Miscellany*, Mar. 11, 1843; *The Guardian*, July 31, 1858; *St. Louis Leader*, Oct. 27, 1855; Brownson, *Works*, X, "Socialism and the Church", 79-110; "Channing, on Social Reform", *ibid.*, 137-206, "Liberalism and Socialism", *ibid.*, 526-550. For a typical expression of Catholic opposition to "sumptuary legislation" see an editorial on the Maine Temperance Law, *Pittsburgh Catholic*, Apr. 21, 1855.

⁴⁰ Brownson, "The Fugitive Slave Law", *Works*, XVII, 19.

as inevitable inequalities of fortune resulting from the differing "capability, diligence, health and strength" of human beings.⁴¹ They have regarded the possession of private property as a natural right and an important means of human welfare but because men's needs, the primary title to property, vary, this has never been interpreted as meaning that all persons have the right to equal amounts.⁴² To the minds of many American Catholics such a conception of property was in direct conflict with the abolitionist effort to bring about the immediate confiscation of slave property without compensation to owners who have acquired their slaves in good faith and according to the law of their community.⁴³

Contrary also to dogma was the theory of private judgment in matters of religion. "Infidels and fanatics," wrote Archbishop Hughes of New York, when accusing William Ellery Channing, Theodore Parker, and other Protestant ministers of abolitionist proclivities. "Channing, for instance, was a Socinian, if not an infidel. Parker did not hesitate to preach and write against the divinity of our Lord—he maintained that there would be other and better Christs than the one who died on Calvary."⁴⁴ Bishop Whelan of Wheeling, Virginia, described "abolitionists, infidels and Red Republicans" as the "most deadly enemies" of the church.⁴⁵ Accusing the leaders

41 P. T. Moon, "Catholic Social Action", *Catholic Builders of the Nation*, II, 209-228; J. A. Ryan, *Distributive Justice*, 180, 245; J. A. Ryan and F. J. Boland, *Catholic Principles of Politics*, 13-27.

42 Ryan, *op. cit.*, 46-47, 272.

43 Brownson, *op. cit.*, 19-23; *Freeman's Journal*, July 21, 1855, *Catholic Mirror*, Sept. 27, 1851; John England, *Letters on Domestic Slavery*, 49; "Address to members of the clergy and the House of Delegates of the diocese of Charleston", *U. S. Catholic Miscellany*, Nov. 14, 1840.

44 Hughes to Augustin Cochin, Jan. 28, 1862. Ms. in the archives of St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, New York.

45 Whelan to Archbishop Hughes, Undated letter at St. Joseph's Seminary. See also, Bishop England to Paul Cullen, Feb. 1836, *Records of the Amer. Cath. Hist. Soc. of Philadelphia*, VIII, 218; Pastoral of Bishop Henni of Milwaukee, *Freeman's Journal*, Mar. 2, 1861. There is an echo of these charges of in-

of Protestantism of making a religion of reform, Patrick Donohoe of the Boston *Pilot* declared that :

they exhibit a striking zeal and earnestness in the propagation of their peculiar notions, and when the sneer or gibe is flung at them, they take up the Sacred Book, and each opposing lunatic conceives he finds something there to arm him in his cause. With audacious irreverence they tell you that such were the doctrines of Christ, and thus they perpetrate their follies under the assumption that they are promulgating His divine code.⁴⁶

Protestant divines who criticized Catholic failure to support abolitionism were roundly rebuked for what one writer described as their "mist-veiled unintelligibility of infidelity."⁴⁷ The *Pilot*, quoting a newspaper reference to Theodore Parker as a "very formidable wild fowl," commented not too wittily: "A wild fowl? Eggsactly. A wild goose, he means. We hope that when the other wild geese fly to the South, next fall, Theodore will fly with them."⁴⁸

The *Pilot* was on every occasion outspoken in opposition to the current "isms" — always including abolitionism — and Patrick Donohoe, its editor was frequently engaged in wrangles of some sort with the reform group in Boston. Apropos of a

fidelity in A. Y. Lloyd, *The Slavery Controversy*. Writing in 1939, Mr. Lloyd stated: "That the Southern charges of infidelity as applied to the abolitionists were literally true is indicated by the fact that a Massachusetts abolitionist stated in the London Abolition Convention that if the Bible sanctioned slavery, he was quite ready 'to throw it from him, and learn again his religion and philosophy from the flowers of the fields.'" *Ibid.*, 190. After citing other examples of the same sort the author concluded: "It seems quite probable that the emphasis placed upon the Bible during the controversy led to a wave of infidelity and atheism in the North and created a spirit of religious revival in the South." *Ibid.*, 193, 190-193.

⁴⁶ *Pilot*, Oct. 22, 1842; June 5, 1858.

⁴⁷ "The Catholic Church and the Question of Slavery", *op. cit.*, 266; W. H. Bean, *op. cit.*, 321-322.

⁴⁸ *Pilot*, June 28, 1851. Henry Ward Beecher was another clergyman for whom Catholics had a particular dislike on this score. *Ibid.*, May 2, 1846.

convention of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society in 1843, he declared that :

Not only have they destroyed for a quarter of a century at least, the hopes of freedom for the slave, but they have spread throughout this Republic, the flame of discord, and reared up a political lobby which works powerful mischief in our State and National councils. They convulse it with the storm of continued but fruitless agitation ; not the agitation which strong minds and calm intellects would give birth to, and sustain, in the efforts to produce some great moral revolution, but one that is conceived in the brains of graceless mountebanks, and supported by feeble and insane old women, and continued in a spirit of offensive and factious violence and irreverent infidelity which shocks the moral sense of the respectable and intelligent mass of our citizens.⁴⁹

And again :

As a general thing, wherever you find a free-soiler, you find an anti-hanging man, woman's rights man, an infidel frequently, bigoted Protestant always, a socialist, a red republican, a fanatical teetotaler, a believer in mesmerism, Rochester rappings, and in every devil but the one who will catch him. You get in a rather dirty set, you perceive, when you join their ranks.⁵⁰

The same point of view was evident in the Catholic press in other parts of the country. Thus, the editor of a paper published within the limits of the slave section wrote :

It is time for the enlightened Protestants of the South to open their eyes to the mischievous tendencies of this hypocritical system, which is always invoking the Bible and whose champions are yet the very first to trample on its most sacred principles. Had even one Catholic priest been guilty of one-tenth of the mischievous impiety which is the general rule

⁴⁹ *Pilot*, Feb. 11, 1843. Also Oct. 22, 1842.

⁵⁰ *Pilot*, reprinted in *Pittsburgh Catholic*, June 7, 1851.

with these Northern Protestant preachers, we would never hear the end of it. Why should one standard be established whereby to judge Catholics and another whereby to judge Protestants.⁵¹

From the columns of the *Baltimore Mirror* came another typical diatribe against individualism in religion and private interpretation of the Scriptures :

Men unblest with the infallible guidance of the Church of Christ will wrangle till doomsday on points of morality as well as of dogma. Both parties, so far as they profess to be Christians, appeal to the Bible; but their oracle is dumb, or what is worse, speaks with a double tongue. North of Mason & Dixon's line, private judgment being the interpreter, it declares slave-holding to be a soul-destroying sin, South of that famous boundary, speaking by the same interpreter, it pronounces the same thing "a cherished domestic institution". Thus we have one morality for the North, another for the South, and consciences are governed on vital questions according to geographical divisions. Protestant moral theology must be studied on the map: it varies with degrees of latitude --and all this is beautifully illustrated by the dissensions in the Protestant Synods and Presbyteries, and the debates in Congress.⁵²

In the midst of the Know-Nothing campaign, a third spokesman for border state Catholics, disclaiming interest in political struggles beyond the hope of seeing the "Union saved from the Anti-Slavery Republicans, and the Constitution from the Know-Nothings" went to the length of expressing a desire "to see Sam triumph rather than Sambo."⁵³ The mischief the former could do would be "temporary and local" but the latter constituted a threat to the Union which, if unchecked, could end only in "general and final catastrophe."

⁵¹ *The Guardian* (Louisville), Nov. 12, 1859.

⁵² *Catholic Mirror*, Jan. 26, 1850.

⁵³ *St. Louis Leader*, Nov. 10, 1855. "Sam" was used to refer to a Know-Nothing as "Sambo" was used for a Negro.

Among immigrant Catholics there were also political and economic motives for dislike of abolitionism. They had in general given their allegiance to the Democratic Party which had an established record of friendship for the foreign-born and appeared to them from its "professions of attachment to liberty and equality" more truly representative of the aspirations which they had brought with them from Europe.⁵⁴ This in turn accentuated their devotion to the state rights and popular sovereignty theories as opposed to the radical abolitionist and free soil elements.⁵⁵ "When," asked the *Catholic Telegraph*, speaking for the Irish on one occasion, "has the Whig, Anti-Slavery or Republican party treated the Irish-born citizens with ordinary courtesy? The organs of these parties persistently abused them for their ignorance, and slandered the Church of their fathers."⁵⁶ German Catholics were more strongly opposed to slavery but in their case, too, the fact that the free-thinking, rationalist revolutionaries among their countrymen were interested and active in the abolitionist movement served to keep them within the Democratic fold.⁵⁷

Concentrated as they so often were within the lowest income bracket, these immigrants were apt to resent the competition of

54 Brownson, "Slavery and the Church", *Works*, XVII, 317; *Pilot*, Nov. 1, 1856; *Freeman's Journal*, June 21, 1856; Father Moore to the Editor of the *Rochester Democrat*, *op. cit.*, 263-264.

55 T. L. Nichols, *Forty Years of American Life*, 348; O'Connor, *op. cit.*, 13-14; *Freeman's Journal*, July 28, 1860.

56 *Catholic Telegraph*, May 4, 1864; L. C. Gray, *The Hidden Civil War*, 29-30; D. V. Smith, "The Influence of the Foreign Born of the Northwest in the Election of 1860", *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XIX, 203, n. 46; Resolutions of an Irish Meeting in St. Paul, *Freeman's Journal*, March 23, 1861; Brownson, *op. cit.*, 317-318.

57 For resolutions of a group of Massachusetts Germans denying affiliation with the antislavery agitation, see *Pilot*, Aug. 16, 1856. For discussion of German Catholics and slavery see Carl Wittke, *We Who Built America*, 245, 228-229; Gilbert Garraghan, *The Jesuits of the Middle United States*, II, 165-167; John Rothensteiner, *History of the Archdiocese of St. Louis*, II, 174; Smith, *op. cit.*, 203, n. 46; Joseph Schafer, "Who Elected Lincoln", *American Historical Review*, Oct., 1941, 56; *St. Louis Leader*, Dec. 27, 1856.

the Negro worker in the labor market. Especially was this true of the Irish who tended to settle in the cities and larger towns and who furnished much of the unskilled labor supply.⁵⁸ This antagonism took the form of anti-Negro demonstrations of one sort or another, some of which culminated in violence, destruction of property, and actual loss of life.⁵⁹ While it inclined the Irish workmen to oppose any program which might encourage Negro migration to the North, it was reflected likewise in the barbs aimed by the Celtic editors at the "false philanthropy" of reformers whose "hearts were as soft as butter towards the oppressed colored laborers in the south, but as hard as flint towards a large portion of the white laborers."⁶⁰

If Catholic opinion associated abolitionism with European radicalism and condemned it for its connection with New England reform movements, the link between American and British antislavery groups which had induced the Irish-American population to turn upon their idolized "Liberator," aroused further suspicion. This was to be expected in papers like the *Pilot*, the *Freeman's Journal*, or the *Metropolitan Record* which were recognized organs of the Irish-born citizenry. Each of these did in fact take frequent occasion to ridicule the "British philanthropy" which with its eyes fastened on the black slaves of America was blind to the white slaves of the homeland.⁶¹ They

58 *Archbishop Hughes to Wm. H. Seward*, July 19, 1863, Ms. at St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, N. Y.; *Pilot*, July 20, 1861.

59 W. E. B. DuBois, *Black Reconstruction*, 17-31; Gray, *op. cit.*, 65; Sir Charles Lyell, *A Second Visit to the United States*, II, 161; C. G. Woodson, "The Negroes of Cincinnati Prior to the Civil War", *Journal of Negro History*, I, 13-16; R. W. Shugg, *Origins of Class Struggle in Louisiana*, 119-120.

60 *Pilot*, Nov. 20, 1856; Oct. 22, 1859; *Freeman's Journal*, June 7, 1856; *Metropolitan Record*, Jan. 18, 1862.

61 *Pilot*, Dec. 3, 1859, May 1, 1847, May 14, 1853; *Freeman's Journal*, Nov. 22, 1856, Oct. 19, 1861. Robert Walsh, the native born son of Irish parents, took a similar stand in 1819 when he penned a reply to the critical judgments upon the United States which were appearing in various British publications at the time. Walsh devoted a chapter to slavery and the slave

missed no opportunity to warn their readers of British designs on the safety and prosperity of the Union and to remind them of her share in the responsibility for the original introduction of African slaves into the colonies.⁶² In a day when journalistic writing inclined to vehement and often vitriolic language, they went the limit in their efforts to discredit the hated Britannia.

When prose failed to satisfy their needs they turned to poetry to express more adequately their bitter feelings on the subject. Typical of this type of writing was a lengthy poem which appeared in the *Metropolitan Record*.

All you who start upon the world's highway
Will meet a sort of peddling man some day;
Should you not purchase from the peddling man,
Look out—he'll surely slay you if he can,

it warned, and after describing the brutality of the "peddling man" to an Irishman, an Indian, a Frenchman, and a Spaniard in turn, it followed him to the United States:

He met a merchant from the Northern States;
And after very many fine debates
On lofty themes, "All slaves shall yet be free"
He said: "We think alike, you'd better deal with me".

He met a hot-blood planter of the South,
And thus to him, did say with all his mouth,
"Cotton shall be *my* king as well as *thine*;
Whate'er sustains it is of right divine.

He dined them both one time, and with a *power*
Of rum and beefsteak fed them a whole hour.
While they, the whites of both his eyes could see,
He said, "Love, love each other; deal with me".

trade in which he attributed the responsibility for its introduction in the American colonies to Great Britain. He held that under the American system slaves were better off in every way than slaves in the British West Indies or even white laborers in England. Robert Walsh, *An Appeal from the Judgements of Great Britain Respecting the United States of America*, 306-424.

⁶² *Pilot*, July 11, 1846, Nov. 2, 1850; *Freeman's Journal*, Oct. 30, 1853.

In time the kinsmen quarreled, and with that
 He culled fresh texts of Scripture for his hat;
 And with his conscience for his only guide
 He lent a cleaver to the weaker side".⁶³

Conspicuous among these pro-slavery Irishmen was John Mitchel. Mitchel, who traveled the length and breadth of the United States in the cause of Irish freedom, was equally vehement in his insistence that the Negroes remain slaves. While not a Catholic himself he numbered many among the readers of his various newspaper ventures and he was assisted in the editorship of the *New York Citizen* by Francis Thomas Meagher, who, as a Catholic, could speak for that branch of the Irish American community. In a famous controversy with Henry Ward Beecher Mitchel brought out all the familiar arguments of the Irish defenders of the slave system, chief among these being, of course, the old cry of British domination.⁶⁴

Indeed he went further than many of his compatriots when he declared: "We deny that it is a crime, or a wrong or even a peccadillo, to hold slaves, to buy slaves, to sell slaves, to keep slaves to their work by flogging or other needful coercion." And he concluded: "as for being a participant in the wrongs, we for our part wish we had a good plantation well-stocked with healthy negroes in Alabama."⁶⁵

⁶³ *Metropolitan Record*, Nov. 29, 1862.

⁶⁴ The controversy developed as a result of an answer by Mitchel to an open letter addressed to Meagher by an Irish Quaker, one James Haughton, who was trying to rally Irish opinion in the United States against slavery. *Citizen*, March 3, 1854. During Meagher's absence from New York Mitchel replied to Haughton in the editorial pages of the *Citizen*. William Dillon, *Life of John Mitchel*, II, 43-49; *Citizen*, Jan. 14, 1854. The discussion continued in the issues of Jan. 28, Feb. 11, 1854. For a series of editorials attacking Mitchel for his "betrayal" of the cause of "human freedom", see *New York Tribune*, Jan. 14, 19, 27, 1854. For Beecher's reply to Mitchel, see *ibid.*, Feb. 2, 1854.

⁶⁵ *Citizen*, Jan. 14, 1854. Meagher later published a rejoinder in which he refused to recognize the right of Haughton or anyone else to require an expression of his views on African slavery, and announced his intention of refraining from a declaration of his views until three years hence when the completion of the naturalization process would give him the right to speak as a citizen. *Citizen*, April 8, 1854.

Meagher, who was Mitchel's fellow-editor and co-worker for Irish independence, carried on the Mitchel tradition in public addresses and in the columns of the *Irish News* which he edited for a time in New York.⁶⁶ After the outbreak of the war, however, Meagher held it to be the duty of Irishmen to support the Union. The disruption of the Republic would, he argued, be a threat to human freedom everywhere, most of all to the prospect of Irish freedom. As a result he enlisted in the 69th Regiment from New York and later in the Irish Brigade of the Union army, attaining the rank of Brigadier-General.⁶⁷ John Mitchel, by contrast, threw in his lot with the Confederacy and his three sons fought with the Confederate army.⁶⁸

Other Catholics, who were not so avowedly pro-Irish, also shared the mistrust of Britain, fairly prevalent then as often since among the American public. Attempts on the part of the English government to enforce the international agreements against the slave trade on the African coast brought forth such an expression from the *Catholic Mirror* of Baltimore, a paper which ordinarily displayed little interest in the Irish question. Highest ecclesiastical authority had repeatedly condemned the enslaving of free persons as a serious infringement of the Christian law, but British interference with American ships was another matter. Said the *Mirror*:

That slavery is an evil we all admit, North and South, but it is an evil that outside agencies must not be allowed to tamper with in any respect; especially such agencies as the political tricks of British philanthropy. Our slaves live in Paradise, if we compare their condition with that of the

⁶⁶ Mitchel continued his pro-slavery stand throughout the pre-war period. Dillon, *op. cit.*, II, 101-114; *Citizen*, March 4, May 27, Sept. 23, 1854; *Irish News*, March 6, 1858. From 1857-1859 he published the *Southern Citizen* in Knoxville, Tennessee and in Washington, in which paper he continued his defense of slavery and of southern society. Dillon, *op. cit.*, II, 99-133.

⁶⁷ Michael Cavanagh, *Memoirs of General Thomas Francis Meagher*, 367-487; *Irish News*, Sept. 27, Oct. 25, 1856, March 14, 1857.

⁶⁸ Dillon, *op. cit.*, II, 164-212.

wretched subjects of Great Britain in India. Perhaps history will some day commend British philanthropy for this very game of seizing ships upon the high seas, for the humane purpose of rescuing human beings from bondage, but those of us who look at the agencies in actual operation, see no cause for admiring her course. What does she do with the slaves when she takes them from the slave-ship? Why she enslaves them for a term of years under the title of apprenticeship.⁶⁹

Similarly, Orestes Brownson, a New England convert to Catholicism, who certainly could not be accused of over solicitude for Irish interests, was resentful of English interference in American affairs. Comparing the position of the British laborer to the average plantation worker he found the latter infinitely happier.⁷⁰ And sometime after the Civil War had broken out, Archbishop Purcell of Cincinnati—by that time an outspoken advocate of emancipation as a war measure—accused Great Britain of following her old policy of “divide and conquer” by stimulating the abolitionist fanaticism to which he attributed the chief responsibility for driving the South to secession.⁷¹

Parenthetically, it might be observed that on the slavery question there was a considerable lag between American and European Catholic thought. In Europe prominent members of the Church gave their support during the first half of the century to emancipation in the colonial possessions of their various countries. In England Daniel O’Connell joined the group of Englishmen who were sponsoring emancipation of West Indian slaves. In France Montalembert, Cochin, and others were similarly active in antislavery organizations while members of the clergy and hierarchy signed a petition to the French Chambers

69 *Catholic Mirror*, June 12, 1858; *St. Louis Leader*, July 7, 1855.

70 Brownson, “The Presidential Nominations”, *Works*, XV, 490.

71 Quoted in *Catholic Mirror*, Sept. 13, 1862 and *Catholic Telegraph*, Sept. 3, 1862; H. C. Carey, *The Slave Trade*; J. W. Cummings, “Slavery and the Union”, *Freeman’s Journal*, May 25, 1850.

for the extinction of slavery in the French colonies.⁷² Later, in the midst of our Civil War, the bishop of Orleans, Felix R. P. Doupanloup, issued a pastoral calling for prayers for the release of the unfortunate Negroes still held in bondage in the United States and condemning slavery more strongly than did any member of the American hierarchy, North or South.⁷³

Successive papal pronouncements had condemned the reduction of free men to bondage and forbidden Catholics to engage in the slave trade.⁷⁴ Pius IX, the reigning pontiff when the American slavery controversy was at its height, took occasion during the beatification ceremonies in honor of Peter Claver, the apostle to the Cartagena slaves, to condemn all who "sold men for gold," and he later conferred a papal decoration upon Augustin Cochin for his book, *L'Abolition de L'Esclavage*.⁷⁵

In general Catholic opinion abroad was coming more and more to outright condemnation of slavery. Long experience showed that conditions laid down by the Church for humanizing and regulating it had proved impracticable or were too commonly ignored.⁷⁶ Moreover, the system was itself an anachronism, out of harmony with modern principles of individual freedom and democracy. The impact of contemporary social

⁷² *Catholic Telegraph*, Sept. 16, 1863. For an article by Montalembert on the "Fall of Slavery", see *ibid.*, July 12, 1865. For the petition of the French clergy, see *ibid.*, Nov. 7, 1847. See also Augustin Cochin, *The Results of Slavery*, Balmes, *op. cit.*, Paul Allard, "Esclavage", *Dictionnaire Apologétique de la Foi Catholique*, V, 1514-1522; "La Race Negre", *Revue du Monde Catholique*, I, 78-88, 278-286, 649-668. For sentiment in South America, see Arnold Lunn, *Peter Claver*, 100-102, 105-110; Donald Pierson, *Negroes in Brazil*, 51, 54-57.

⁷³ "Pastoral Letter on the Subject of the Civil War in the United States, April 6, 1862", *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society*, XXV, 18-29.

⁷⁴ Summarized in Allard, *op. cit.*, 1519-1522; Leo XIII, *To the Bishops of Brazil on the Church and Slavery*; also *infra*, Chapter I.

⁷⁵ *Catholic Telegraph*, Sept. 16, 1863, Allard, *op. cit.*, 1520.

⁷⁶ Lunn, *op. cit.*, 60; J. J. Fox, "Ethical Aspect of Slavery", *Catholic Encyclopedia*, XIV, 39-41.

and political theories naturally influenced the course of Catholic thought. That American Catholics did not adopt more widely a similar point of view is probably attributable to the interpretation which their leaders gave to the tradition of the Church on the subject of slavery and to influences arising from social conditions of the time, the political affiliation of the church members, and the economic situation in which they found themselves.⁷⁷ In these circumstances the Catholic population came to regard abolitionists as enemies of religion, of public law and order, and of the Union which they, as naturalized citizens, had sworn to support.⁷⁸

⁷⁷ See a letter of a recent immigrant settled in Illinois, contrasting the attitude of Catholics in the United States with his European experience. *Catholic Telegraph*, May 27, 1863.

⁷⁸ *Pilot*, Oct. 22, 1846, Jan. 13, 1849, July 26, 1856; *Catholic Telegraph*, June 24, 1863.

CHAPTER VI

SECTIONAL DIVERGENCE—THE CHURCH NORTH

DURING the latter years of the slavery controversy hierarchical and clerical spokesmen, the editors of the religious press, and other Catholic leaders in the North, reiterated with increasing frequency the traditional church policy towards human bondage. At the risk of repetition but in order to present more clearly the point of view common among northern Catholics, it may be well to quote at some length from Archbishop Hughes of New York, who probably more than any prelate of his time was the symbol of Catholicism in his section :

An inquiry might arise in some minds as to how the Catholic Church regards it in a moral point of view. I shall answer that question very briefly. The Catholic Church considers, and has so taught, that naturally all men are free—and that it is a crime for one man to reduce another, both being equally free, into bondage and slavery. Hence she has ever set her face against what has, in modern times, been called the slave trade. But when slaves have been introduced into a country she does not require of her members that they be restored to their primitive condition, which would be oftentimes worse than the one in which they are placed. She would require in such cases that the master should treat the slave with all humanity and Christian care and protection. And that the slave finding himself in such a condition should bear with his lot and be faithful to his master.

It is true that at the present day slavery is not recognized except on the Continent and Islands of America. And it is equally true that God has so permitted the development of human misfortune on one side, and human passions on the other, that at the present moment neither the master nor the slave is individually responsible for the condition which they respectively occupy, one towards the other. And in these circumstances what can we say of the policy of the Church?

We can only say in reply to this question that the teachings of the Church if strictly adhered to would sanctify at least in this regard, both the master and the servant. The master by requiring him to be the head and guardian and protector of his slaves as well as of his immediate family. The servant by requiring that he should be obedient, faithful, moral and loyal to his master. And thus both would be in the line of obedience to the Supreme Master who created all.¹

At the same time this position did not necessarily involve a defense or acceptance of slavery as a positive good. Archbishop Hughes himself had gone on record as "no friend of slavery" even as he rebuked the abolitionism of his friend Daniel O'Connell.² In this respect the philosopher-editor, Orestes Brownson, for a time resident in the New York diocese and something of a thorn in the side of its bishop, was for once in agreement with his ecclesiastical superior. Brownson, consistent in his opposition to the radical antislavery movement, expressed nevertheless his personal repugnance to slavery as "an evil to be borne, rather than to be sought, to be confined rather than extended."³

From the religious weeklies came similar expressions. "If there is a social evil that includes an extensive and galling wrong to thousands—nay millions, that evil is negro slavery even as it exists in the United States. This we believe is admitted by all—in these quarters."⁴ Thus, the *Catholic*, organ of the Pittsburgh diocese and distinguished among its contemporaries for moderation of language and restraint in the discussion of political issues. The *Philadelphia Catholic Herald*

1 John Hughes, *Notes on Slavery*, Ms. St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, N. Y. See also Hughes, *Works*, II, 222.

2 J. R. G. Hassard, *Life of John Hughes*, 435.

3 Orestes Brownson, *Works*, XVII, "Slavery and the Incoming Administration", 71; XII, "The Church and the Republic", 11-12; XV, "Abolitionism and Slavery", 45-63; XVI, "Slavery and the Mexican War", 25-59; Brownson to William Lloyd Garrison, *American Catholic Historical Researches*, XII, 50-52. For a treatment of the evolution of Brownson's attitude towards the slavery question, see Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., *Orestes Brownson*.

4 *Pittsburgh Catholic*, Dec. 22, 1849.

and *Visitor*, discussing territorial elections in Kansas in the fall of 1857, expressed the hope that under the constitution soon to be voted upon:

a new Commonwealth will be admitted into the Confederacy unsullied by the taint, and unblighted by the curse of Institutions as incompatible with the national prosperity as they are hostile to the national peace. It is very possible that men may be found to lament a result of the protracted strife in Kansas, which does not range the people of that state immediately and emphatically in the van of the crusade against Slavery in the Union. But such will not be the disposition of those who value the union of these states, as not alone the guarantee of our present greatness, but the hope as well, of the future for a just and pacific solution of the mighty problem which oppresses the nation.⁵

All "patriots," the editorial concluded, would rejoice in the "prostration of fanaticism on the plains of Kansas" and the defeat of projects "for the subjugation of freedom and of free men."

This was in substance the opinion common in the Catholic press of the North during the pre-war period.⁶ It was essentially the position taken also by such laymen as Senator James Shields of Illinois and that earlier Catholic opponent of slavery, Robert Walsh of Philadelphia.⁷

⁵ *Catholic Herald and Visitor*, Oct. 25, 1857.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Sept. 26, 1857; *Freeman's Journal*, Mar. 14, 1857; *Pilot*, Apr. 19, 1842, June 6, 1849, Mar. 3, 1855; *Catholic Telegraph*, Feb. 19, 1842.

⁷ For Shields, see his speech on the Compromise of 1850. *Congressional Globe*, 31st Cong., 1st Sess., XIX, 646-650; R. J. Purcell, "James Shields", D. A. B., XVII, 106-107. For Walsh, see his pamphlet written during the Missouri Compromise discussions, *Free Remarks on the Spirit of the Federal Constitution, the Practice of the Federal Government, and the Obligations of the Union, Respecting the Exclusion of Slavery from the Territories and New States*. Cf. also *Freeman's Journal*, Nov. 2, 1850; "The Catholic Church and the Question of Slavery", *Metropolitan Magazine*, June, 1855, 265-273; *Influence of Catholic Doctrine on the Emancipation of Slaves*, By a member of the Sodality of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Church of the Holy Rosary, East Boston; J. W. Cummings, "Slavery and the Union",

Catholic doctrine explicitly condemned the African slave trade and spokesmen for the Church were united in their opposition to proposals for repeal of the American prohibitory legislation.⁸ Enforcement of the Fugitive Slave laws, on the other hand, they supported on the basis of the legitimate claim of the slave owner to his property and the obligation of the citizens to obey the law of the land.⁹

The question of the extension or exclusion of slavery from the territories should be decided, they believed, by the local inhabitants. Neither section had the right to seek exclusive possession of any portion of the national domain nor was it the function of Congress to make laws for the territories in regard to their internal affairs. Finally, any methods adopted for doing away with the slave system should be originated by the individual states whose sole responsibility it was, according to such interpretations of the Constitution, to regulate matters of domestic concern.¹⁰

This was good state rights doctrine which appealed to many Catholics then as it has on more recent occasions.¹¹ The fact

Freeman's Journal, May 25, 1850; John Hughes, "Influence of Christianity upon Social Servitude", *Works*, I, 3-17; Brownson, "The Catholic Church and Slavery", *Works*, XVII, 331-335; Jaime Balme, *Protestantism and Catholicity Compared*, 90-115. Balme was frequently cited as a reference by American Catholics in discussions on slavery.

8 *Pilot*, Aug. 8, 1857, Jan. 25, 1859; *Freeman's Journal*, Aug. 7, 1858; *Tablet*, Sept. 29, 1860; Brownson, "Slavery and the Incoming Administration", *Works*, XVII, 67-68.

9 *Pilot*, June 17, 1854, Apr. 26, 1856; *Freeman's Journal*, Dec. 22, 1855; Brownson, "The Higher Law", *Works*, XVII, 1-12; Senator Shields, *op. cit.*, 650. An exception to this general tendency was David C. Broderick of California who opposed Fugitive Slave legislation in his state. R. J. Purcell, "Senator David C. Broderick of California", *Studies* (Dublin), Sept., 1939, 420.

10 Brownson, "The Slavery Question Once Again", *Works*, XVII, 77-94; *Pilot*, March 3, 1855, June 14, 1856, Sept. 17, 1859; *Freeman's Journal*, Feb. 9, 1850, Mar. 14, April 11, June 13, 1857, July 7, 1860; *Catholic Herald and Visitor*, Mar. 7, 1857; T. L. Nichols, *Forty Years of American Life*, 348.

11 For a statement of this point of view by a prominent member of the American hierarchy see William Cardinal O'Connell, "Reasonable Limits of State Activity", *Catholic Education Review*, Nov. 1919, 513-527.

that the majority belonged to the Democratic Party was an obvious influence in winning their support for state regulation. The European experience of the church in the papal states and elsewhere was another. Ecclesiastical leaders, mindful of conflicts between church and civil authorities in the Old World, were fearful of tendencies toward greater centralization of governmental powers in the United States. Convinced that slavery was a matter of local concern, they quite generally advocated state rather than federal control.¹² In this respect the discussions among Catholics over the Child Labor Amendment furnish a recent analogy. It is true that a small though distinguished group, believing that federal legislation was necessary to check the exploitation of children favored its passage.¹³ The prevailing tenor of ecclesiastical opinion, however, opposed the amendment as a dangerous grant of power to the federal government and by far the greater number of Catholics accepted this view.¹⁴

During the years when church members were formulating their opinion on various aspects of the slavery question the attitude of the average Catholic towards political and social as well as religious issues was influenced even more than it is today by clerical judgment and by the religious journals which were frequently reflective of that judgment. Because of the social and economic situation of the bulk of the Catholic population, there were comparatively few laymen who possessed the education or experience necessary for effective leadership. Nor

12 Archbishop Hughes to Bishop Lynch, *Metropolitan Record*, Sept. 7, 1861; Bishop Augustine Verot, "Sermon of Jan. 4, 1861", *Freeman's Journal*, June 18, July 9, 1864; Bishop England in *U. S. Catholic Miscellany*, Nov. 14, 1840; Father J. Cummings, "Slavery and the Union", *op. cit.*; Father Daniel Moore to the Editor of the *Rochester Democrat*, quoted in F. J. Zwierlein, *The Life and Times of Bishop McQuaid*, I, 264.

13 J. A. Ryan, "The Proposed Child Labor Amendment", *Catholic World*, CXX, 166-167; *Social Doctrine in Action*, 223-225; George N. Shuster, "Shall We Ban Child Labor", *Commonweal*, Apr. 16, 1934, 623-624; Senator T. J. Walsh, Jan. 8, 1925, *Congressional Record*, 68th Cong., 2nd Sess., Part 2, 1438-1447.

14 V. A. McQuade, *The American Catholic Attitude on Child Labor since 1891*, 99-100.

was lay leadership encouraged or desired by ecclesiastical authorities of the time. It seems probable, therefore, that the laity for the most part must have adopted the opinion thus supported by practically all the recognized channels of opinion in their church.

There were some few Catholics whose position in the pre-war decades veered to both sides of the conservative, middle of the road stand of the majority of their co-religionists. An example of one such on the antislavery side comes in a reprint from the correspondence columns of the *Pilot*. The *Pilot* had been outspoken in criticism of abolitionist attempts to interfere with the enforcement of the Fugitive Slave laws in Massachusetts. Its correspondent, describing himself as Irish born, lodged a protest against a stand which he denounced as "unworthy of all confidence, as unpatriotic and unchristian." Accusing the editor of "defending and supporting the institution of slavery, and opposing and ridiculing in an unjust and uncalled for manner, every effort put forth for the protection and amelioration of the poor down-trodden and abused race, the enslaved Africans," he wrote that "as a native of Ireland, a Catholic Christian, as one whose heart bleeds for the suffering children of my oppressed country, I cannot but feel for the whole human race who are suffering in bondage and oppression."¹⁵ Thus, John Lambert of Factory Point, Vermont.

Another of these was Henry J. Carey—economist and son of the Irish-born Mathew Carey. The father had contributed to the support of the Colonization Society and had written in defense of its plan for settling freed slaves in Liberia.¹⁶ The son, disliking slavery as he saw it in the United States, advocated a protective tariff, which, by stimulating diversified local industry, might be an effective instrument for bringing about universal emancipation.¹⁷

¹⁵ Reprinted from *Pilot* in the *Pittsburgh Catholic*, June 7, 1851.

¹⁶ E. L. Fox, *American Colonization Society*, 62, 161; Mathew Carey, *Letters on the Colonization Society*.

¹⁷ H. J. Carey, *The Slave Trade*.

In California Senator David Broderick, the native-born son of Irish-Catholic immigrants, aligned himself with the anti-slavery wing of the Democratic Party. Unlike most Irish politicians of the day, Broderick was an avowed opponent of slavery in both state and national politics though he denied any abolitionist affiliation and professed his respect for the constitutional rights of the southern states in regard to the existent institution. Concern for the welfare and progress of free labor, however, induced him to oppose its extension.¹⁸

While serving as a member of the territorial Senate in California, Broderick supported the constitutional provision prohibiting slavery and he showed his friendship for the Negro when he secured the tabling of a resolution from the lower house to exclude free Negroes and persons of color from the state.¹⁹ Broderick was elected to the United States Senate in 1857.²⁰ In his maiden speech he spoke against the Lecompton Constitution on the grounds that it imposed slavery upon Kansas against the will of the majority of the settlers and he joined with Stephen A. Douglas in his fight to defeat the bill.²¹ Subsequently he denounced the Kansas-Nebraska Act for its repeal of the Missouri Compromise—in his opinion another attempt to force slavery on the people.²²

A second Catholic senator, James Shields of Illinois, was more moderate in attitude but he, too, opposed the extension of the slave system.²³ During the Senatorial discussions over the Compromise of 1850 Shields joined in the debate to deny

18 *Congressional Globe*, XXVII, 1st Sess., 35th Cong., Appendix, 191-193. This interest in free labor led him to fight the "coolie system" for Chinese workers in California. Purcell, *op. cit.*, 420.

19 *Ibid.*, 420.

20 *Ibid.*, 423.

21 *Congressional Globe*, XCVII 1st Sess., 35th Cong., 163-164, 1120, 1239; Purcell, *op. cit.*, 425.

22 Mar. 22, 1858, *Congressional Globe*, XXVII, Appendix, 191-193.

23 Purcell, "Shields", *op. cit.*, 106-107; Speech of Senator Shields, Apr. 5, 1850, *op. cit.*

that the Constitution carried slavery where it was not positively excluded by law. "Slavery," he said, "being in violation of natural right can only exist by positive enactment."²⁴ Admitting that northern abolitionists had given the South grounds for grievance he deplored the exaggeration of such grievances by southern hotheads and warned them that people in the North would never permit free soil to be changed to slave if they could prevent it by constitutional resistance.²⁵

On the other side was the well known New York lawyer, Charles O'Connor, active in Democratic circles and counsel in several Fugitive Slave cases in his state.²⁶ As attorney for the alleged owner in each case O'Connor had opportunity to include in the legal brief an expression of his personal views on slavery. Holding that "Negroes alone and unaided by the guardianship of another race" were incapable of sustaining a "civilized social state," that constitutionally they were fit only for labor in warm climates, which by the same token were unsuitable to the white man, he claimed for the "intellectual white race" the right to seek compensation, "for the mental toil of governing and guiding the negro laborer," in the "gratuitous service" of the slave.²⁷

O'Connor shared the Democratic devotion to the principle of state sovereignty and he would leave to the South the control of slavery unhampered by any abolitionist interference. Indeed, in his efforts to combat the "sentimentality" of abolitionism, he went beyond some of his co-religionists in Democratic circles. When in a public address on the eve of the Civil War, he asserted of slavery that "It is not unjust; it is just, wise and beneficent" and declared that "in climates where the black race can live and prosper, nature herself enjoins correlative duties on the black man and on the white, which cannot be performed ex-

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 648.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 648-649.

²⁶ Jack & Mary Martin, 12 *Wendell* 311, 14 *Wendell* 507; *Lemmon v. The People*, 20 *New York Reports* 562.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 573-576.

cept by the preservation, and if the hissing gentleman please, by the perpetuation of negro slavery," he was rebuked by James McMaster, the staunchly Democratic editor of the *Freeman's Journal*.²⁸

It was during the war years, however, that cleavage among northern Catholics developed most sharply. The debate which preceded the issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation precipitated an acrimonious editorial controversy in the Catholic press and brought out the divergences of opinion among church members. With one or two exceptions the press was loyal to its Democratic allegiance though, where McMaster of the *Freeman's Journal*, or Mullaly of the scurrilous *Metropolitan Record* went all out for the Peace Democrats and were rightly regarded as bulwarks of Copperheadism, Patrick Donohoe of the *Pilot*, Father Purcell of the *Telegraph*, and the editors of the *Pittsburgh Catholic* and the *New York Tablet* were devoted to the Union cause and in favor of a vigorous prosecution of the war to reunite the nation as speedily as possible. The rank and file of the Catholic congregation likewise seem to have remained true to their Democratic affiliation even though they varied in the degree of support which they gave to the war.²⁹

A wordy battle between the archbishop of New York and Orestes Brownson which took place in the fall and winter of 1861-62 brought to light the conflict of ideas within the Catholic ranks.³⁰ Brownson, in the October '61 issue of his *Review*, had taken occasion in a commendatory notice of Augustin Cochin's *L'Abolition de l'Esclavage*, recently published in France, to suggest emancipation of the American slaves as a

²⁸ Charles O'Connor, *Negro Slavery Not Unjust*, 11, *Freeman's Journal*, July 28, 1860.

²⁹ Expressive of this allegiance is an address by Richard O'Gorman before the Democratic Club of Philadelphia, Feb. 22, 1863, *Freeman's Journal*, Mar. 14, 1863. See also Brownson, "Slavery and the Church", *Works*, XVII, 317-318.

³⁰ Brownson, *Works*, XVII, "Slavery and the War", 144-178; "Archbishop Hughes on Slavery", 178-210. For the Archbishop's reply to Brownson, see *Metropolitan Record*, Oct. 12, 1861.

war measure "to defeat the rebellion."³¹ This was a position towards which he had been tending in the years just prior to the war, as a result of what he regarded as southern "aggression" in seeking the territorial expansion of slavery and making unjust demands for northern cooperation to protect and maintain the slave system.³²

Archbishop Hughes under the stress of increasing sectional conflict had by contrast adopted a more definitely proslavery position—at least to the extent of stressing the conservatism of his church on the question of abolition and the importance of leaving the whole issue to be disposed of by action of the states where slavery existed as a domestic institution. In his younger days as a student in Emmitsburg, Maryland, he had been moved to write a poem depicting the woes of the slaves and the anomaly of their life in a land where, as the poor slave of the poem lamented,

Those who show a fairer hand
Enjoy sweet liberty
But from the moment of my birth,
I slave along Columbia's earth,
Nor freedom smiles on me.
Long have I pined through years of woe
Adown life's bleeding track,
And still my tears, my blood must flow,
Because my hand is black.³³

During the fifties the Archbishop came to feel an increasing anxiety for the survival of the Union, which in turn strengthened his dislike of abolitionism. He was even more inclined to

31 Brownson, *op. cit.*, "Slavery and the War", 146.

32 Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., *op. cit.*, 242-244; Brownson, *Works*, XVII, "Slavery and the Incoming Administration", 54-77. "The Slavery Question Once More", 77-94. In the latter Brownson challenged the decision in the Dred Scott case that the Negro had never had rights of citizenship, and expressed his belief that this "pro-slavery" stand of the court would win support for the abolitionist cause in the North.

33 Hassard, *op. cit.*, 42-44.

stress the Catholic goal of spiritual freedom in a heavenly paradise for which men's sojourn in this world was but a brief interlude of preparation. And after a trip of some weeks to Cuba and certain of the slave states he appeared more impressed by the general physical well-being of the slaves on the plantations which he had visited than concerned for their social or intellectual debasement.³⁴

In pursuance of this line of thought Archbishop Hughes published in the *Metropolitan Record* a lengthy refutation of the Brownson thesis, which was unsigned but generally attributed to his pen.³⁵ The heat of the moment may have carried him away but at any rate Hughes went further in his extenuation of the southern institution than in his earlier utterances. Claiming that Brownson had given the abolition of slavery as the sole purpose of the war (actually the latter had said he would favor the destruction of slavery if it were necessary to defeat the rebellion), he asserted that Catholics had no intention of fighting a war for anything but the preservation of the Union.³⁶ Declaring that abolitionists who sought immediate emancipation stood "in need of a strait-jacket, and the humane protection of a lunatic asylum," he raised the problem of how to provide for the slaves if suddenly emancipated.³⁷

In a discussion of the origin and justification of human bondage Hughes followed a reasoning comparable to the scriptural defense of Hammond or Dew in the *Pro-Slavery Argument* and of Bishop England in the *Letters*. Insisting that the Catholic

34 "Sermon of April 30, 1854", *Works*, II, 219-223 and *Freeman's Journal*, May 6, 1854; Hughes to Bishop Lynch, *op. cit.*, Hughes to Augustin Cochin, Jan. 28, 1862, Ms. at St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie; Hughes, *Notes on Slavery*, Ms. at St. Joseph's Seminary.

35 Hughes admitted authorship in a letter to Wm. H. Seward. Hassard, *op. cit.*, 437. Archbishop Hughes attempted, however, to keep his identity secret from the public. The editor of the *Record* refused to disclose the author and the Archbishop pursued the same policy in a letter to the *Paris Journal des Debats*, reprinted in the *Metropolitan Record*, Mar. 1, 1862.

36 *Metropolitan Record*, Oct. 12, 1861; Brownson, *Works*, XVII, 146.

37 *Metropolitan Record*, *op. cit.*

Church had never interfered with slavery where it was already established except by "religious and moral suasion," he stated that though it was not a divine institution it was "at least a Divine permission of God's providence," and denied that any article by Brownson could induce Catholics to "forsake the wise and good old paths of their Divine Master and His Church."

It was in his remarks on the slave trade that Hughes really overreached himself. Though he explained that the Church had always condemned such traffic, and expressed his own abhorrence of the trade in human beings, he described Africa as a country of savages where perpetual warfare and wholesale murder made the slave status in the United States a heaven by comparison. In these circumstances he professed himself unable to discover the "crime even of the slaver in snatching them from the butcheries prepared for them in their native land," and found the purchasers relieved of "any moral transgression of the law of God or of the law of man" where the traffic was authorized and the masters observant of their responsibilities to care adequately for the "unfortunate" Africans.

In conclusion, the Archbishop admitted that he was not unaware of the moral arguments against slavery, notably the interference with marriage and the break-up of families. Referring, however, to the condition of poor female workers in the North and the treatment of unmarried mothers and their babies, he reminded his readers that it was "for those who are without sin to cast the first stone."

Brownson in his reply repeated his belief that the liberation of the slaves "as a war measure necessary to save the Union" was "justified and called for by military necessity."³⁸ Maintaining that neither Archbishop Hughes nor Catholics as a body were proslavery, he described them as opposed to abolitionism in the past—as had been true of his own position—because they believed it not only contrary to Catholic policy but

³⁸ *Works*, XVII, 186.

unconstitutional and dangerous to the stability of the Union. These objections he held had now been removed by the rebellion of the southern states.

The Archbishop's discussion of the slave trade, he reviewed at some length. Obviously, declared Brownson, no Catholic, much less a prelate, could favor such traffic in human souls. Either from haste or lack of space Hughes must have failed to express himself clearly. Finally, Brownson reminded his readers of the obligation imposed upon them by their Catholicity "to labor assiduously for the progress of civilization."³⁹ Such progress, he pointed out, was inconsistent with the further perpetuation of slavery.

Shortly thereafter at the request of President Lincoln and Secretary Seward, Archbishop Hughes went abroad to rally support for the Union cause in Ireland, France, and Rome, where he had considerable influence and the discussion between the two ended. The Archbishop's statement served to encourage those editors who for various reasons were opposing a change in the status of the slave population. Among them, Brownson was already anathema because of his strictures on Irish Catholic immigrants and they rejoiced to see him rebuked by so prominent a member of the hierarchy.⁴⁰

Previous clashes with that outspoken layman perhaps inclined Archbishop Hughes to take the offensive against Brownson. He was no doubt influenced also by mistrust of abolitionism and an exaggerated fear of Negro insurrection to which his acquaintance as a young priest with refugees from the Dominican massacres contributed.⁴¹ A year or so later these fears made him critical of the Emancipation Proclamation although on other

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 210.

⁴⁰ For a scathing criticism, see *Metropolitan Record*, Jan. 18, 1862. Somewhat more moderate in tone were the *Pilot*, Sept. 13, 1862 and the *Tablet*, Jan. 18, 1862. The *Pittsburgh Catholic*, on the other hand, recommended to its readers a "careful study" of Brownson's two articles, Apr. 26, 1862.

⁴¹ Hughes to the Editor of the *Journal des Debats*, *Metropolitan Record*, Mar. 1, 1862, Hughes to Cochin, *op. cit.*

issues connected with the war he had strongly supported the Lincoln administration.⁴² Eagerness to maintain unimpaired the loyalty of his predominantly Irish flock was another factor which encouraged the Archbishop to take so firm a stand against abolitionism.⁴³ This was a matter of concern to him from the outbreak of the war. In October, 1861, in a letter to Secretary of War Cameron, he deplored the fact that there was being "insinuated" in his part of the country the idea "that the purpose of this war is the abolition of slavery in the South." Archbishop Hughes warned that:

The Catholics, so far as I know, whether of native or foreign birth, are willing to fight to the death for the support of the constitution, the Government, and the laws of the country. But if it should be understood that, with or without knowing it, they are to fight for the abolition of slavery, then indeed they will turn away in disgust from the discharge of what would otherwise be a patriotic duty.⁴⁴

As emancipation came closer Catholic hostility mounted. The press, with one or two exceptions, attacked it with a vigor that led them virtually to endorse the perpetuation of slavery for an indefinite time.⁴⁵ The motives underlying this attitude were

⁴² *Hughes to N. L. Richardson*, Dec., 1862. Ms. at St. Joseph's Seminary. This was a letter intended for publication with a group of clergymen who had been selected by Dr. Richardson to express disapproval of the Emancipation Proclamation. It was not published because of the refusal of some of those approached to make a public statement of their views. *Richardson to Hughes*, Dec. 7, 1862. Ms. at St. Joseph's. For Hughes' plea for a vigorous prosecution of the War, including the drafting of such soldiers as was necessary to hasten the end, see his sermon on his return from Europe in August, 1862. *Metropolitan Record*, Aug. 23, 1862.

⁴³ Hassard, *op. cit.*, 440-447, 486-501; Rena M. Andrews, *Archbishop Hughes and the Civil War*.

⁴⁴ Quoted in Hassard, *op. cit.*, 437. See also Hughes to Seward, Oct. 10, 1861, *ibid.*

⁴⁵ The *Freeman's Journal* and the *Metropolitan Record* were very partisan in their politics and displayed the most pronounced Negrophobia. The *Pilot* and the *Tablet* showed greater interest in reconstructing the Union on the

several. The traditional opposition to immediatism, political convictions, the fear that interference with slavery would prolong the war by alienating the last vestige of southern pro-Union sentiment, the feeling that the slave status, however unfortunate in the abstract, was the only instrumentality available at the time for governing the untutored Negro population, apprehension on the score of the economic and social consequences of mass emancipation, each of these appeared with varying emphasis in the discussions which continued until well after the issuance of the Proclamation.

Nor must it be overlooked that most of the editors were of Irish ancestry and their subscribers belonged mainly to the immigrant body. The antipathy to free Negroes prevalent among the workingmen of the lower wage level in the North is a well recognized historical fact. It had become apparent in the course of the abolitionist crusade and it showed itself again when the probability of emancipation raised the spectre of mass migration of black workers.⁴⁶

Politically minded editors like McMaster of the *Freeman's Journal* or Mullaly of the *Metropolitan Record* were quick to play up these feelings in their fight against President Lincoln and the Republican Party. The latter painted a dark picture of the "horrors" to be let loose upon the country in the event that the abolitionist program were adopted.

basis of the status quo as the easiest and quickest method of reunion. The *Catholic Herald and Visitor* showed less interest in political discussions but expressed the opinion that it would be better for both races to arrange some kind of colonization outside the United States. Aug. 30, 1862. Significant editorials showing these viewpoints are in the *Tablet*, Dec. 14, 1861, Oct. 4, 1862; *Pilot*, Aug. 12, Nov. 23, July 27, 1861, Mar. 22, Oct. 4, 1862, Sept. 19, Oct. 17, 1863. Following the Emancipation Proclamation, the *Pilot* became more critical of Lincoln's administration. Dec. 13, 1862, Jan. 10, 17, 1863. See also *Freeman's Journal*, May 10, 24, Dec. 2, 20, 1862, Jan. 31, 1863; *Metropolitan Record*, Mar. 15, May 10, 24, Oct. 4, 1862, Jan. 3, 1863.

⁴⁶ *Metropolitan Record*, Aug. 9, 1862; Hughes to Seward, July 19, 1863. Ms. in St. Joseph's Seminary; *Freeman's Journal*, Aug. 2, 1862.

Need we say to the great mass of our population, the mechanics and labourers of our country, that the success of the abolitionist programme would be the worst evil which could befall them, that the influx of negro labour on the Northern market would reduce them to a condition worse than that of the pauperized operatives of Europe? The disruption of the labor system of the South would not only do this, but it would throw upon the country all the helpless and infirm, the young and the aged, who form no inconsiderable portion of the slave population, and who would have to be supported in some way either in the prison or the poorhouse, either by vice or by charity. We sincerely hope that we shall never be called upon to solve the terrible problem which the abolitionists would force upon us, but that the people will be content with the restoration of the Union to the same condition in which it was left by the founders of the Republic.⁴⁷

In August, 1861, because of his attacks upon the government, James McMaster was imprisoned in Fort Lafayette and his paper was temporarily suspended.⁴⁸ Nothing daunted by this he was, when permitted to resume publication, outspoken in opposition to policies which he thought might encourage the Negroes to seek work in the North. He suggested the adoption by the New York legislature of a bill to exclude them from the state, and declared that if they "did drift in" they must be "driven out again, imprisoned or exterminated."⁴⁹

The Boston *Pilot*, while strongly Unionist in sympathy, likewise worried over the prospect of Negro competition with the white worker. Before the war, despite its opposition to abolitionism, this paper had taken in general an antislavery stand. But the prospect of sudden emancipation and a consequent influx of Negroes to the North appalled an editor who had always considered the white laborers as his special concern. Placing

⁴⁷ *Metropolitan Record*, Jan. 18, 1862. The anti-administration stand of the *Record* became so violent that in March, 1863 Archbishop Hughes withdrew his endorsement from the paper.

⁴⁸ R. J. Purcell, "James McMaster", D. A. B., XII, 140.

⁴⁹ *Freeman's Journal*, July 18, 1863.

himself on record in support of legislation to exclude freedmen, he wrote:

The negro indeed is unfortunate, and the creature has the common rights of humanity living in his breast; but, in the country of the whites where the labor of the whites has done everything, but his, nothing, and where the whites find it difficult to earn a subsistence, what right has the negro either to preference, or to equality, or to admission? When rights collide, it is the stronger that should prevail: for it has the more reason—without which there can be no right—to support it. What has the African done for America? What great or even decent work has his head conceived, or his hands executed? We pity his condition: but it is unjust to put him in the balance with the white laborer. To white toil this nation owes everything: but to black, nothing.⁵⁰

From statements such as these, it was but a step to an even more radical racism. "The Negro," stated Mullaly, "is what the Creator made him—not a rudimentary Caucasian, not a human being in the process of development, but a negro, and such he will be at the Last Day if the race is not extinct."⁵¹ From the *Pilot* came the claim that "one of the oldest established facts of nature is the mental and physical fitness of the Negro for servility." This paper saw the government contending by means of the Emancipation Proclamation and other policies for the interest of the freedmen alone, while, under the influence of an "idolatry for Negroes" which "had its origin in false philanthropy and squeamish sentimentality," the white men were completely forgotten.⁵²

Secession of the southern states, the resort to arms, and war-time emancipation did tend to stimulate emancipation sentiment among some Catholics who had accepted slavery as a

⁵⁰ *Pilot*, Aug. 16, 1862. See also *Irish News*, Sept. 6, 1856.

⁵¹ *Metropolitan Record*, June 14, 1862; *Irish News*, Sept. 22, 1860.

⁵² *Pilot*, Dec. 26, 1863.

necessary evil at best, and who now blamed it for the disruption of the Union. Spokesman for this group was the *Catholic Telegraph* of Cincinnati.⁵³

The archbishop of Cincinnati, John B. Purcell, judiciously conservative prior to secession, was thereafter a staunch supporter of the Union cause.⁵⁴ He publicly expressed his joy at the abolition of slavery, found nothing objectionable in the way it was accomplished, and criticized the Episcopal bishop, John Henry Hopkins of Vermont, for attempting "to sanctify the crying sin of the South in holding millions of human beings in spiritual and physical bondage."⁵⁵ For this stand, the irrepressible McMaster denounced the Archbishop as a "political abolitionist."⁵⁶ Purcell, in turn, took occasion to rebuke the "journalists of the North, especially the *Freeman's Journal* and the *Metropolitan Record* of New York, who instigated our too confiding people to evil words and deeds, and the people themselves who patronized such journalists and were duped and deceived by their malignity."⁵⁷

The editor of the *Telegraph*, Father Edward Purcell, shared his brother's views on the subject of emancipation. Taking the Brownson position that the rebellion of the southern states against the federal authority justified emancipation, Father

⁵³ For support of this position, see *Pittsburgh Catholic*, Mar. 22, June 7, 1862. For a typical criticism, see *Metropolitan Record*, May 31, 1862.

⁵⁴ Speech at the Catholic Institute in Cincinnati, Jan. 31, 1861, reported in *Tablet*, Feb. 2, 1861; Sermon of Nov. 1861, in *Metropolitan Record*, Nov. 23, 1861; Letter to the president of Mt. St. Mary's, Oct., 1861 in M. M. Meline and E. F. McSweeney, *The Story of the Mountain*, II, 10; Pastoral Letter, *Guardian*, May 18, 1861.

⁵⁵ Sermon of Aug., 1862, *Catholic Telegraph*, Sept. 3, 1862. He blamed the South for failure to develop some plan of gradual emancipation with a preliminary period of education of the slaves "to be men". See also Lenten Pastoral, *Freeman's Journal*, Feb. 6, 1864; Pastoral of Nov. 13, 1864, *Catholic Telegraph*, Nov. 16, 1864; Pastoral on the occasion of the national fast and mourning for President Lincoln, *Catholic Telegraph*, May 24, 1865.

⁵⁶ *Freeman's Journal*, Feb. 6, 1864.

⁵⁷ Pastoral of Nov. 13, 1864, *op. cit.*

Purcell denied that abolition could longer be considered a revolutionary measure. "In a word," he wrote, "since the slave aristocrats commenced their revolution, the position of Northern parties is reversed. What was conservative now opposes law and order, and what was radical now supports government."⁵⁸

In numerous editorials Purcell expressed his relief that the stain of slavery could at last be expunged from the nation. "There is no heavier calamity," he declared. "It corrupts heart and soul, and we have no respect for the Christianity of any person who, now that the evil is dying out, would wish to see it restored."⁵⁹ Again and again, in the face of increasingly bitter attacks from his fellow editors, he insisted that slavery and Catholicism had been proved incompatible and that the policy of the Church had always been one of amelioration and gradual emancipation to bring about eventual abolition.⁶⁰

A deluge of criticism descended upon Father Purcell and his paper as a result of this stand. Led by McMaster and Mullaly, the other editors were not far behind in their cries of "abolitionism" and "betrayal of Catholic interests."⁶¹ Answering his critics, Purcell maintained that he had never supported abolitionism, had in fact always opposed it, "but now that the work is done and slavery nearly dead, we wish to put our Catholic friends on their guard against doing anything to revive it." As authority for his position he cited the bishop of Louisville, Martin J. Spalding, and the Spanish moral theologian, Balmes, whose writings were fairly widely circulated among the American Catholic reading public.⁶² He pointed out that

⁵⁸ *Catholic Telegraph*, Nov. 18, 1863.

⁵⁹ Sept. 9, 1863.

⁶⁰ July 9, 1862, Apr. 8, 22, May 20, June 10, 1863.

⁶¹ *Metropolitan Record*, July 11, 1863; *Freeman's Journal*, May 23, June 27, Nov. 28, 1863; *Pilot*, July 25, Aug. 1, Sept. 12, 1863; *Catholic Herald and Visitor*, quoted in *Catholic Telegraph*, Dec. 2, 1863.

⁶² *Catholic Telegraph*, Apr. 22, 1863; M. J. Spalding, *Miscellanea*, 139; Balmes, *op. cit.*; *Catholic Telegraph*, May 6, Apr. 8, 1863.

any one, who "after the slaves were once set free without injury to vested rights, would strive to reduce them again to bondage," would be engaging in the slave trade and thereby become subject to excommunication, and he urged the "masses" of his co-religionists not to be "misled into opposition to the dearest maxims of the Church."⁶³

Nor did the Cincinnati editor forget the white laboring men. In their interest and to save the black workers from a serfdom which would "last for all time" he would have limitations placed upon the migration of Negroes to northern states.⁶⁴ But he informed his readers that the war was a "war of slaveholders against white labor" and, urging them to support the Union cause, reminded them that the end of the plantation system would open to countless immigrant families the "fertile fields of the South."⁶⁵ At the same time Father Purcell took care to point out that he was not advocating immediate racial equality. "The natural superiority of the white race ought to be carefully preserved" but this was "impossible so long as slavery exists because the poor white man is just as much, or to great extent, in the power of the rich planter as the slave." Therefore, let the system be abolished, and then the problem of the freedmen "grappled with" in such a way as to protect the legitimate rights of each.⁶⁶ This was plain enough speaking but only to be expected of a paper that described itself as "the largest Catholic Journal in the United States; opposed to Slavery and Disunion; the advocate of Justice and Freedom."⁶⁷

Support for the Purcells came from a variety of sources. The zealous Brownson had by 1862 become an unqualified

⁶³ Sept. 30, 1863. For an extended discussion of the secular editors, "the adventurers, school masters out of employ, ex-novices of religious orders, or authors of unpublished books," see Aug. 3, 1864.

⁶⁴ Aug. 13, 1862.

⁶⁵ Aug. 20, 1862, Apr. 15, July 15, 1863.

⁶⁶ July 15, Sept. 23, 1863; Jan. 20, 1864; Aug. 30, 1865.

⁶⁷ Jan. 11, 1865.

advocate for the immediate extermination of the slave system.⁶⁸ In Massachusetts, an anonymous member of an East Boston parish penned an antislavery tract in which he undertook to prove that Catholic policy had always favored emancipation.⁶⁹ From different parts of the North, messages of encouragement and congratulation poured in to the *Telegraph*.⁷⁰ Members of the clergy, their scruples against abolitionism removed by the war, likewise endorsed the demise of slavery. In Chicago, Father Thaddeus Butler, working to secure the loyalty of his parishioners, spoke out repeatedly against the "wrong of secession and the heinousness of rebellion." Nor did he trouble to refute charges of abolitionism aimed at him because of his avowed antislavery views. "Call me an abolitionist if you please," he declared, "but I hold fast to my colors."⁷¹

68 Brownson, *Works*, XVII, "Slavery and the Church", 341-352, "Emancipation and Colonization", 253-272; "Confiscation and Emancipation", 293-316. Brownson did not, however, claim complete equality for the Negro. He held rather that man was entitled to certain natural rights but obliged to earn social and civil rights. The Negro, being more degraded than the white man, would take longer to merit such privileges. See "Abolition and Negro Equality", *op. cit.*, 536-560.

69 *Influence of Catholic Doctrine on the Emancipation of Slaves*, Boston, 1863.

70 From New York, *Catholic Telegraph*, May 27, June 10, June 17, 1863, Jan. 20, 1864; from Ohio, June 17, 1863; from Yonkers, N. Y., Sept. 23, 1863; from Philadelphia, Feb. 1, June 7, 1865. Other expressions of approval, June 24, July 29, Sept. 16, 1863.

71 Gilbert Garraghan, *The Catholic Church in Chicago*, 183-188. See also J. J. McGovern, *The Life and Letters of Eliza Allen Starr*, 191-192; Garraghan, *The Jesuits of the Middle United States*, II, 151-153; *Catholic Telegraph*, June 3, July 8, Dec. 23, 1863.

CHAPTER VII

SECTIONAL DIVERGENCE—THE CHURCH SOUTH

IN the South, Catholics, like their Protestant neighbors, rallied to the defense of the southern way of life as they saw it endangered by northern aggression. As far as the hierarchy and clergy were concerned, the peculiar situation of the Catholic community in that section as well as the traditional policy of the Church in the United States tended to intensify their efforts to remain aloof, officially at least, from the controversy. Even in the years when antislavery sentiment was fairly widespread in the upper South, ecclesiastical authorities had avoided public expressions of opinion which might align them with the opponents of the slave system.¹

When it came to private correspondence there was less reluctance to express distaste for certain aspects of the institution as it existed under the American tradition. In the early years of his episcopate, John Carroll, who as the scion of a slaveholding family was well acquainted with the slavery of his state, explained his conception of clerical responsibility in the face of practices which might be contrary to the tenets of the Church. Writing to the missionary priest and New England convert, John Thayer, who had evidently asked to be relieved of his parish in Alexandria because he could not reconcile slavery with his own conscience, Bishop Carroll said:

While you confine yourself within the bounds of solid doctrine, you may act freely, and unrestrained by any ecclesiastical interference, in remedying the abuses of slavery; and when you

¹ S. L. Theobald, "Catholic Missionary Work among the Colored People of the United States (1776-1866)" *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, XXXV, 328-329. U. B. Phillips, *American Negro Slavery*, 115-131, 425; Thomas Jefferson, *Notes on Virginia*, Query XVIII, 225-228. See also W. S. Jenkins, *Pro-Slavery Thought in the Old South*; Avery Craven, *The Coming of the Civil War*.

have done your duty, if all the good effect possible and desirable does not ensue from your endeavors you must bear that, as every pastor must bear the many disorders, which will subsist in spite of his most zealous exertions. Would we be justifiable for abandoning our charge, because we cannot stem the current of infidelity, profane swearing, the sins of the flesh? I see no difference in these cases: your cooperation or acquiescence is required no more in favour of the irregularities of one kind than of another. I am as far as you from being easy in my mind at many things I see, and know, relating to the treatment and manners of the Negroes. I do the best I can to correct the evils I see; and then recur to those principles which I suppose, influenced the many eminent and holy missionaries in S. America and Asia, where slavery equally exists.²

Some years later, Bishop England, reporting to the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda on conditions in the Charleston diocese, was equally frank. After enumerating the various difficulties which made his charge a particularly trying one, he expressed his determination to carry on in spite of his "disgust with the conditions of the slaves, brought into my diocese under a system which perhaps is the greatest moral evil that can desolate any part of the civilized world."³

Dearth of source material makes it difficult to generalize about lay opinion during this period. In all probability it reflected the pattern of thought prevalent in the community. A case in point is the attitude taken by the most distinguished layman of the Revolutionary and early national period, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, the largest slaveholder in Maryland. Like

² "Letters from the Archbishopal Archives at Baltimore", *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, XX, 58-59; R. J. Purcell, "Father John Thayer of New England and Ireland," *Studies* (Dublin), June, 1942, 181.

³ Peter Guilday, *The Life and Times of John England*, I, 531. See also Augustin Cochin, *The Results of Slavery*, 394-395; Father Wm. Harold in Guilday, *op. cit.*, 20; Gilbert Garraghan, *The Jesuits of the Middle United States*, I, 614, 618-619; M. M. Meline and E. F. McSweeney, *The Story of the Mountain*, I, 554, 408-409.

other leading political figures of his time in Maryland and Virginia he came to question the compatibility of slavery with the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and to look for some orderly remedy for the situation.

Carroll gave his support to several post-Revolutionary attempts in his native state to work out some kind of gradual emancipation and in his later years he served as an officer of the Colonization Society.⁴ While his membership in a church which held a definite theory of human brotherhood may have encouraged this stand one cannot ignore the influence which custom and force of public opinion must have exerted in Maryland at this particular time.

During the opening decades of the century another distinguished Catholic citizen of Maryland took much the same stand. Roger B. Taney served as vice-president of a local chapter of the Colonization Society and from time to time he used his legal talents to protect the interests of the free Negroes of the state.⁵ In 1818 he acted as counsel for Jacob Gruber, a Methodist clergyman who had run afoul of the law by some antislavery utterances delivered in the course of a sermon at Hagerstown, Maryland. Sentiment in favor of emancipation or at least critical of slavery, was fairly strong in Maryland at this time. In his argument for the accused, under indictment on the charge of inciting slaves to insurrection, Taney revealed that he had been influenced by the mood of his community as well as by the traditional policy of his church.⁶ Significant in this respect is the following extract from the Gruber argument:

A hard necessity indeed, compels us to endure the evils of slavery for a time. It was imposed upon us by another nation, while yet we were in a state of colonial vassalage. It cannot be easily or suddenly removed. Yet while it continues,

4 J. R. Brackett, *The Negro in Maryland*, 53-54; E. H. Smith, *Charles Carroll of Carrollton*, 270.

5 C. B. Swisher, *Roger B. Taney*, 13-14.

6 *Ibid.*, 95-98.

it is a blot on our national character, and every real lover of freedom confidently hopes that it will be effectually, though it must be gradually wiped away, and earnestly looks for the means by which this necessary object may be attained. And until it shall be accomplished, until the time come when we can point without a blush to the language held in the Declaration of Independence, every friend of humanity will seek to lighten the galling chain of slavery, and better, to the utmost of his power, the wretched condition of the slave.⁷

William Gaston of North Carolina was another Catholic prominent for many years in the politics of his state.⁸ He, too, on various occasions expressed dislike for the slave system and concern for the welfare of the Negroes, slave and free. In 1832, addressing the students of the State University at Chapel Hill on the "Duties of Citizenship," Gaston warned that upon them would

devolve the duty which has been too long neglected, but which cannot with impunity, be neglected much longer, of providing for the mitigation, and, (is it too much to hope for in North Carolina?) for the ultimate extirpation of the worst evil that afflicts the Southern part of our confederacy. Full well do you know to what I refer, for on this subject there is with all of us a morbid sensitiveness which gives warning even to an approach to it. Disguise the truth as we may and throw the blame where we will, it is slavery which, more than any other cause, keeps us back in the career of improvement. It stifles industry and represses enterprise—it is fatal to economy and providence—it discourages skill—impairs our strength as a community and poisons morals at the fountain head.

How this is to be encountered, how subdued is indeed a difficult and delicate inquiry, which this is not the time to examine, nor the occasion to discuss. I felt, however, that I could not discharge my duty without referring to the subject

7 J. T. Scharf, *History of Maryland*, III, 308-309.

8 R. J. Purcell, "Judge William Gaston, Georgetown University's First Student", *Georgetown Law Journal*, May, 1939; H. J. Schaminger, *William Gaston of North Carolina, Statesman and Jurist*.

as one which ought to engage the prudence, moderation and firmness of those who sooner or later must act decisively upon it.⁹

Gaston attended the North Carolina Constitutional Convention of 1835 where he opposed a provision depriving Negro freeholders of the right, hitherto enjoyed, of voting for members of the state Senate and House of Commons.¹⁰ "Let them know" he said, "that they are part of the body politic, and they will feel an attachment to the form of government and have a fixed interest in the prosperity of the community, and will exercise an important influence on the slaves."¹¹ Gaston had the support of the representatives from the western counties but the proslavery Easterners won out and the free Negroes were disfranchised.

It was as justice of the Supreme Court of North Carolina that Gaston made his most significant contribution to the welfare of the Negroes. In view of his expressed attitude it is not surprising that in this capacity he should have introduced a distinctly milder note into North Carolinian law. The case of *State v. Will* came before him not long after he had taken his seat on the bench.¹² The slave Will, having fatally injured his overseer in an attempt to protect himself from a brutal assault, was condemned to death. On appeal, Judge Gaston declared that the circumstances of the injury made the Negro guilty of manslaughter rather than murder. Malice, he asserted, did not exist in cases where the slave was "excited into unlawful violence, by the inhumanity of his master or temporary owner, or one clothed with the master's authority." "Unconditional surrender is the general duty of the slave. Unlimited power is, in general,

9 Quoted in *American Catholic Historical Researches*, VIII, 71.

10 J. S. Bassett, *Slavery in the State of North Carolina*, 39-42.

11 *Ibid.*, 40. In 1838, in his capacity as justice of the Supreme Court, Gaston ruled that manumitted slaves were citizens of the state and entitled to equality of rights with the white man in the same circumstances. *State v. Manuel*, 20 N. C. 144, quoted in 19 Howard 573; Purcell, *op. cit.*, 879-880.

12 *State v. Will*, 18 N. C. 121; Bassett, *op. cit.*, 25-27.

the legal right of the master. But this does not authorize the master to kill his slave, and the slave has the right to defend his life against the unlawful attempt of his master to take it."¹³

In 1840, reversing a decision from the lower court by which a slave had been convicted of the murder of a white man in a quarrel, Gaston ruled that an assault from one not his master, which endangered the life of a slave, changed what would in other circumstances be murder to homicide. And he said further:

the law would be savage if it made no allowance for passion. He may have been disciplined into perfect obedience to the will of his master, and, therefore, habitually patient under his correction; but he cannot but feel a sense of wrong when authority is wantonly usurped by a stranger, and exercised with cruelty. There is therefore no difficulty in laying it down that a battery which endangers his life or great bodily harm — proceeding from one who has no authority over him — will amount to such a provocation.¹⁴

Judge Gaston was resident in a state where there had long been considerable antislavery sentiment and where the institution itself took on in general a milder character than in other sections especially in the deep South.¹⁵ Moreover North Carolina court decisions and slave laws were noteworthy for a comparatively humane spirit and for the respect which they showed for the life of the Negro.¹⁶ In such circumstances it was natural enough for any North Carolinian to act and speak as did William Gaston. Religious convictions and his own inclinations may have been contributing influences but, to account for his

¹³ *State v. Will, op. cit.*

¹⁴ *State v. Jarrott*, 23 N. C. 86.

¹⁵ R. H. Taylor, "Humanizing the Slave Code of North Carolina", *The North Carolina Historical Review*, II, 328-329; Bassett, *op. cit.*, 47-48, 64-71, 89-93.

¹⁶ H. J. Catterall, *Judicial Cases Concerning American Slavery and the Negro*, II, 1-2; Taylor, *op. cit.*, 323-329; Bassett, *op. cit.*, 11-14, 20-27, 47.

humanity, it is scarcely necessary to look beyond the force of community thought.

As the slavery issue came into greater prominence, the policy of abstention from political controversy appealed more strongly than ever to churchmen, who were finding quite enough within their own sphere of duty to occupy their thought and energy. This note runs through the pre-war pastorals of individual bishops and of the diocesan and provincial synods, a review of which shows that the southern hierarchy, when they approached the slavery question officially, did so to keep the Church free from the taint of abolitionism or to remind their slaveholding congregations of the responsibilities imposed by their Catholicity.¹⁷

Just what the responsibility of the master to his slaves involved in the eyes of the Church may be gathered from the exhortations addressed from time to time to Catholic slaveholders by their spiritual leaders. One of the most detailed of these appeared in a sermon delivered by Augustine Verot, vicar apostolic of Florida, in St. Augustine on the day of "Public Humiliation, Fasting and Prayer," Jan. 4, 1861.¹⁸

In introducing his discussion, Bishop Verot expressed the desire to show on the one hand, "how unjust, iniquitous, and unscriptural" were the assertions of abolitionists who claimed that slavery was "a moral evil, and a crime against God, re-

17 Bishop Ignatius Reynolds, Pastoral of April 8, 1844, *U. S. Catholic Miscellany*, Apr. 13, 1844; Pastoral of the Bishops of the Province of Baltimore, *Catholic Guardian*, June 5, 1858; Pastoral of the Provincial Council of St. Louis, *Catholic Mirror*, Nov. 3, 1855; Pastoral of the Second Provincial Council of St. Louis, *Freeman's Journal*, Oct. 2, 1858. See also Bishop M. J. Spalding, *Miscellanea*, 139-140.

18 *Freeman's Journal*, June 18, July 9, 1864. Cf. Pastoral of Bishop Reynolds, *op. cit.*; Pastoral of the Diocesan Synod of Natchez, Apr., 1858, *Freeman's Journal*, June 5, 1858, Bishop William Elder, Pastoral to the Clergy and Laity of Natchez, Oct. 28, 1858, *Freeman's Journal*, Nov. 13, 1858; Bishop John McGill, *Our Faith the Victory*, 430-431. For a summary of clerical opinion on the relationship between masters and slaves, see *Catholic Mirror*, Apr. 20, 1861.

ligion, humanity, and society," and on the other the conditions under which the state of servitude became "legitimate, lawful, approved by all laws, and consistent with practical religion and true holiness of life in masters." In accordance with this two-fold purpose he cited the theological titles to slave ownership (self sale, capture in a just war, condemnation for crime or debt, and birth of a slave mother), reviewed the divine and ecclesiastical sanctions of slavery — à la England — and then listed the essential requirements for a "just servitude."

This involved, first of all, said the Bishop, recognition of the distinction between domestic slavery and the African slave trade. Any suggestion for the revival of the later should be resolutely opposed. It meant that the rights of free colored persons must be protected, and discriminatory legislation against them regarded as "violations of all justice." And it meant further, that means should be taken to check "libertinism and licentiousness" by protecting the virtue of colored women, slave or free.

As to the more personal rights of the slave population, it was incumbent upon the masters to see that the laws of marriage were respected, that families were not separated by sale, and that adequate food, clothing, and shelter were provided at all times. Finally, slaves must be given religious instruction and the opportunity to perform their religious obligations. Owners, failing in this respect, were guilty of "grievous sin" while those who performed their duty would not only find themselves better served in this world, but would at the same time provide for their well being in the next by acting as "instruments of the eternal happiness of many."

It was inevitable that southern Catholics should become involved in a question which was occupying an increasingly important position in the public mind. They naturally agreed wholeheartedly with northern Catholics on the subject of abolitionism and they likewise turned to the historical position of the Church to explain and justify their attitude towards the "peculiar institution."

In approaching a problem which was essentially a concern of their own every-day lives, Southern spokesmen tended to lay even greater stress upon the universality and conservatism of the Catholic theory of slavery. "It leaves slavery where it finds it," declared the Louisville *Guardian*, "and contents itself with the endeavor to lead men to greater humility, patience and charity, under whatever circumstances Providence may ordain or permit. There is no Catholic Church North and South. The Church is everywhere the same, both for bond and free."¹⁹

Where Northerners in their discussions were inclined as a rule to describe the policy of the Church as looking to eventual abolition, among southern Catholics the chief emphasis was given to the acceptance of the system by scriptural and church authority—with emancipation as a very remote possibility. This was the England thesis as set forth in the *Letters on Slavery*, and it was generally accepted by the Catholic community at large.²⁰

In line with this reasoning it was admitted that slavery was an "evil" or at least entailed "more or less evil unavoidably." It had, however, existed from "the earliest times, under every form of government, even under theocracy," and in some places it was "so interwoven" with the social order that it could not be "abated without the greater evil of social disorganization."²¹ While it was a misfortune, so were "sickness and extreme poverty," and the various other "ills of life which flesh is heir to,"

¹⁹ *Guardian*, Nov. 24, 1860; *Catholic Standard* (New Orleans) reprinted in the *Freeman's Journal*, May 8, 1858; *U. S. Catholic Miscellany*, Dec. 9, 1843; *Catholic Mirror*, Sept. 27, 1851.

²⁰ *Letter of an Adopted Catholic . . . on Temporal Allegiance to the Pope and the Relations of the Catholic Church and Catholics both Native and Adopted, to the System of Domestic Slavery and its Agitation in the United States*, 6-7; Commencement Oration at St. Mary's College, June 25, 1851, *Catholic Mirror*, July 5, 1851; A. H. Brisbane to Archbishop Hughes, Ms. St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie; T. Parkin Scott, Address, *Catholic Mirror*, Jan. 24, 1857; Letter of a Kentucky Priest, *Catholic Telegraph*, Dec. 23, 1863.

²¹ *Catholic Mirror*, July 26, 1856; also *Catholic Standard*, *op. cit.*

and which must be accepted as they are "without attempting by all measures, right or wrong, good or evil, to bring them to an imaginary line of rectitude."²²

Abuses there admittedly were in the system as it was worked out in the United States but this was by no means true for the generality of masters or of slaves.²³ Nor did it justify the violent and unconstitutional procedures sponsored by northern abolitionists. Much as one might "wish that there were no such thing on earth" it was a fact which confronted the southern states not an abstract theory. Under the constitution the responsibility for managing a purely domestic concern devolved upon them, and the federal government was bound not only to respect this right but also to aid in safeguarding the legitimate property interest of the citizens of the South.²⁴

More specifically, this meant that measures such as the Fugitive Slave laws were binding upon all citizens of the Union, and particularly upon Catholics who were required by their church to obey the legally constituted authorities of the country.²⁵ It was interpreted to mean also that Congress had no power to discriminate against southern slaveholders by excluding such holdings from territories which had been "acquired with the Treasure of the whole Union, for the benefit of the whole."²⁶

²² *Catholic Mirror*, Sept. 15, 1860.

²³ *U. S. Catholic Miscellany*, Nov. 17, 1838; Bishop England, Address to the Members of the House of the Clergy, and of the House of Lay-Delegates, at their second annual convention, *U. S. Catholic Miscellany*, Nov. 14, 1840; Roger B. Taney to Rev. Samuel Nott, Aug. 19, 1857, *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, XII, 444-447; A. G. Magrath, *U. S. Catholic Miscellany*, Apr. 23, 1842; J. J. O'Connell, *Catholicity in the Carolinas and Georgia*, 515.

²⁴ *Catholic Mirror*, Sept. 15, 1860, Jan. 25, Sept. 27, 1851, Oct. 29, 1859; *The Guardian*, Jan. 14, 1860; *St. Louis Leader*, Dec. 27, 1856; *Letter of an Adopted Catholic*, *op. cit.*, 6-7; R. B. Taney, *2 opinions of Attorneys General*, 475; also concurring with Justice McLean in *Groves v. Slaughter*, 15 Peters 449; *Swisher, op. cit.*, 508, 586-587, 100.

²⁵ *Catholic Mirror*, Sept. 27, 1851, Jan. 24, 1857; Taney in *Prigg v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*, 16 Peters 539.

²⁶ T. Parkin Scott, *op. cit.*; *St. Louis Leader*, Dec. 27, 1856; *Catholic Mirror*, Feb. 9, Aug. 9, 1856; Bishop Whelan to Archbishop Hughes, Ms. St. Joseph's Seminary; Taney in *Dred Scott v. Sanford*, 19 Howard 393.

When it came to mass emancipation, these Catholic apologists held that there were peculiar problems involved when the slaves were Negroes which had not existed where they had been of the same race as their owners. The Africans, so it was believed, were possessed of "all the bad passions of the more favored races, with less of intellect." Where they had been freed in a body, as in the British West Indies, the results had been far from desirable, and their situation as freedmen in the United States, either in the North or in the South, was deplorable. In consequence, the means of bettering their condition and of "removing the yoke without violence or revolution" should be sought elsewhere than in proposals which, besides endangering the peace and security of society, would deprive the slave of the guidance and protection which his present stage of development demanded.²⁷

On the question of individual manumission, Catholic slaveholders adopted an attitude which again seems attributable both to community custom and to church teaching. Under the influence of the humanitarian doctrines of the Revolutionary era manumissions were fairly common.²⁸ Catholic doctrine likewise encouraged emancipation by the individual owner as an act of Christian charity. Acting under these influences, Archbishop Carroll who owned a number of slaves during his lifetime, provided in his will for their manumission.²⁹ Charles Carroll performed from time to time a similar service for certain of his Negroes.³⁰

When, in the 1820's, Roger Taney freed his slaves, he provided that they should receive their final freedom after a term

²⁷ *Catholic Mirror*, Nov. 12, 1859, July 26, 1856; "Brownson's Review" by a correspondent, *The Guardian*, Aug. 14, 1858.

²⁸ U. B. Phillips, *American Negro Slavery*, 424-427.

²⁹ R. J. Murphy, "The Catholic Church in the U. S. during the Civil War", *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, XXXIX, 274.

³⁰ Smith, *op. cit.*, 266-270; K. M. Rowland, *The Life of Charles Carroll of Carrollton*, 416.

of years—a procedure quite consistent with Catholic teaching which insisted upon the need of preparation for the responsibilities as well as the privileges attached to the free state.³¹ Interesting in this respect is a set of instructions laid down by William Gaston when he placed a young slave boy under the guidance of a local clergyman “to receive moral and religious instruction, to be taught a useful trade, and when qualified to make fit use of his freedom, to be emancipated.”³²

As the century wore on, economic factors, the difficulties involved in the assimilation of the freedmen, and the increased stringency of legislative restrictions on manumission, combined to reduce sharply the number of slaves emancipated—which fell to a new low after the abolitionist activity came into full flower.³³ This, of course, had its influence upon the Catholic owner but it is true also that he might well have been inclined from motives of religion to feel that in existing circumstances the slave was better off in the servile state than in a world where the situation of the freedman was usually far from happy. At any rate there is evidence of a reluctance to grant freedom unless provision could be made to transport the freedmen to some more favorable environment than the United States.³⁴

The possibility of the complete disappearance of the slave system thus came to seem increasingly remote. In the meantime, according to spokesmen for the Catholic community, the evils of the slave system might be removed or at least much

31 Swisher, *op. cit.*, 94; Taney to Nott, *op. cit.*, 447.

32 Quoted in Purcell, *op. cit.*, 867-868. From 1741-1830 emancipations were permitted in North Carolina for “meritorious services to be adjudged . . . of by the county Court.” After 1830 they were permitted “upon the express condition that he, she, or they will leave the state, within ninety days from the granting thereof, and never will return within the state afterward”. Catterall, *op. cit.*, II, 3-4; Bassett, *op. cit.*, 30. After 1830 such “instruction” was restricted since it was forbidden by a law of that year to teach slaves to read or write. *Ibid.*, 100-102.

33 Phillips, *op. cit.*, 426.

34 Thomas Hughes, *History of the Society of Jesus in the United States*, Doc. I, Part II, 1119; Will of Charles Carroll, *Catholic Mirror*, July 26, 1856; Verot, *op. cit.*; Taney to Nott, *op. cit.*

mitigated by the widespread adoption of the "discipline of the Church," by the recognition of the mutual rights and duties of owners and slaves alike, and by the acceptance of the doctrine of spiritual equality implicit in the teachings of Catholicism.³⁵

Such seems to have been the line of reasoning adopted quite unanimously by southern Catholics. Like other citizens of the slave states they were conscious of the social problems involved in the presence in the community of a large number of Negroes, many of whom were not far removed from African barbarism and few of whom were qualified to assume an immediate and unconditional freedom. Their economic interests were tied up with the slave system and they were no more disposed than any others to tolerate aggression against the institutions or interests of their section. In this they were adopting the prevailing tenor of opinion in the pre-war South—which from a religious point of view they were quite free to do, since the question involved was not, in all respects, a matter of faith or morals upon which they would be required to take a distinctly Catholic stand.³⁶

What differences developed were apt to be in emphasis rather than in actual divergence of opinion, or at most on specific details of the general problem. Depending upon a variety of influences, some were more prone to stress the positive advantages of slavery, less ready to admit or welcome the possibility of its eventual disappearance.³⁷ Some, and this was especially true of the clergy, showed greater interest in improving conditions among the slaves, in encouraging individual manumissions, in working towards a gradual abolition of the system,

35 T. Parkin Scott, *op. cit.*; *Catholic Mirror*, Dec. 5, 1857; *U. S. Catholic Miscellany*, Nov. 17, 1838; *Catholic Standard*, *op. cit.* For Judge Gaston's contribution to the mitigation of the slave codes, see *State v. Negro Will*, *op. cit.*; *State v. Jarrott*, *op. cit.*

36 For a discussion of the planter philosophy, see W. S. Jenkins, *op. cit.*; T. C. Smith, *Parties and Slavery*, 294-304; R. B. Flanders, *Plantation Slavery in Georgia*, 283-300; W. E. Dodd, *The Cotton Kingdom*, 48-70.

37 T. Parkin Scott, *op. cit.*, A. H. Brisbane, *op. cit.*; *Catholic Mirror*, July 26, 1856; *Catholic Standard*, *op. cit.*

however remote it might prove to be.³⁸ Others tended to modify their opinions under the stress of changing circumstances.

Perhaps nowhere is this latter more apparent than in the change wrought by increasing sectional discord upon Roger B. Taney. It is interesting to contrast the Taney of the Gruber case with the Taney who, as Chief Justice, wrote the opinion which claimed that Negroes were not included in the Declaration of Independence and, on the basis of their presumed status when the Constitution was adopted, denied to them the rights of citizenship.³⁹ Taney had all his life held strong state rights convictions and by 1857 he had become more attached than ever to this theory. As his biographer points out, he was convinced by this time that southern culture was in jeopardy from northern encroachment, and he was deeply concerned for its protection and maintenance.⁴⁰

It is interesting to note that while the Catholic Chief Justice was responsible for the above opinion, Justice Curtis in his dissent cited the Catholic Judge William Gaston's decision in the case of *State v. Manuel* to support his contention that "free persons descended from Africans held in slavery" were citizens under the Confederacy at the time of the adoption of the Constitution.⁴¹

Under the impact of war and the military emancipation measures Catholic opinion tended again to respond to sectional pressure. As far as secession was concerned geographical factors showed their influence. Thus, from the border states came pleas to maintain the integrity of the Union. Catholic spokesmen believed the South "harassed beyond all reasonable endurance," but they described the disruption of the Union,

38 For clerical statements, see n. 10. Cf. also the position of William Gaston, Roger Taney, and Charles Carroll.

39 *Dred Scott v. Sanford*, 19 Howard 393.

40 Swisher, *op. cit.*, 492 ff., 586-587.

41 *State v. Manuel*, 20 N. C. 144, quoted 19 Howard 573; Purcell, *op. cit.*, 879-880. Gaston held in *State v. Manuel* that manumitted slaves had enjoyed the privileges of citizenship in the province of North Carolina, and subsequently in the state at the time the Confederation was set up.

nevertheless, as a "calamity for the present, and for all time," and they recommended commercial non-intercourse or some other peaceable procedure.⁴² As the probability of armed conflict seemed more certain, sympathy for the South showed itself in the border press which maintained its opposition to the use of force against the seceding states even while continuing to point out the unfortunate consequences to both sections from secession.⁴³

Further South, Catholic opinion was more radical. There, the *Catholic Standard* of New Orleans and the *Miscellany* of Charleston joined forces against their northern and border state colleagues to defend the southern states without qualification as the true defenders of the federal compact.⁴⁴ "It needs," declared the *Miscellany*, "but little knowledge of our history to discover, whether it was the men, who revere state sovereignty, or their enemies, that have been pursuing for years an insidious course of aggression upon that constitution, to which these commonwealths have bound themselves as contracting parties."⁴⁵ And on December 19th the paper announced the removal from its title of the words "United States," those "obnoxious words, which being henceforth without truth or meaning, would ill become a paper" professing to be the advocate of "truth."

⁴² *Catholic Mirror*, Nov. 17, Nov. 24, 1860; *The Guardian*, Nov. 24, Dec. 1, 1860; Bishop Quinlan, Pastoral of Jan. 1, 1861, *U. S. Catholic Miscellany*, Mar. 2, 1861; Bishop McGill, Pastoral, *The Guardian*, Feb. 23, 1861; Bishop Elder at the 2nd Provincial Council of New Orleans, *Catholic Herald and Visitor*, Feb. 18, 1860; Archbishop P. R. Kenrick to the Catholics of St. Louis, John Rothensteiner, *History of the Archdiocese of St. Louis*, II, 211; Archbishop F. P. Kenrick, *Pastoral of 1858*. See also J. J. O'Shea, *The Two Kenricks*, 199-201; F. E. Tourscher, *The Kenrick-Frenaye Correspondence*, 457; J. J. McGovern, *The Life and Letters of Eliza Allen Starr*, 142, 146.

⁴³ *Catholic Mirror*, Feb. 2, Mar. 21, 1856; *The Guardian*, Feb. 9, Feb. 23, Apr. 27, 1861.

⁴⁴ *U. S. Catholic Miscellany*, Dec. 8, 1860; *Catholic Standard*, quoted in *Pilot*, June 8, 1861; *Propagateur Catholique*, quoted in *Pittsburgh Catholic*, Feb. 23, 1861.

⁴⁵ *U. S. Catholic Miscellany*, Dec. 8, 1860.

The members of the hierarchy and clergy in the border states and deep South alike joined in appeals for the maintenance of the Union and for a peaceful settlement of the sectional controversy. After war had actually commenced some differences of opinion were revealed. In border states like Maryland or Missouri ecclesiastics, in deference to the divided loyalties of their congregations, were inclined to restrict themselves to purely spiritual concerns though individually they may have held decided views on the questions involved. Thus, Archbishop Kenrick of Baltimore was in private strongly Unionist and unsympathetic to the proslavery attitude of the editor of the diocesan paper.⁴⁶ His brother, Peter Richard, Archbishop of St. Louis, on the other hand, although equally circumspect in his public utterances, regarded the civil conflict as not only "terrible in nature" but "inexpedient and unjustifiable in its cause." He refused to permit the Union flag to be flown from his cathedral on the grounds that no secular banner belonged there. Although he placed the facilities of his diocese at the disposal of the wounded Unionist troops, his attitude aroused the suspicion of federal authorities sufficiently to cause Secretary Seward to complain to his friend, Archbishop Hughes.⁴⁷

After secession was complete the general tendency was to support the Confederate government on constitutional grounds rather than to insure perpetuation of the slave system. On this point John Quinlan, bishop of Nashville, made himself clear even before his state had actually quit the Union.

46 O'Shea, *op. cit.*, 199-201, McGovern, *op. cit.*, 149-150, 162-163; *Catholic Telegraph*, Aug. 24, 1864. A similar attitude of Bishop Spalding of Louisville is described in J. L. Spalding, *Life of the Most Reverend M. J. Spalding*, 243-252, 263.

47 Rothensteiner, *op. cit.*, II, 210-215; Archbishop Hughes to Wm. H. Seward, Aug. 19, 1862, Ms. at St. Joseph's Seminary. Hughes did not give any details of the complaint but simply informed Seward that he had acted upon the matter. Presumably it was prompted by Kenrick's refusal to fly the Union flag from his cathedral or to give public support to the Union cause. For the attitude of another border state prelate see the letter of Bishop Whelan of Wheeling to Archbishop Hughes in protest against the support extended by the northern clergy to the war policy of the government. Undated Ms. at St. Joseph's Seminary.

But let us not misunderstand while regretting the dismemberment of this great Republic—and heaven knows we would do all we could legitimately to prevent it—we would not purchase Union at the expense of Justice. Better that the instrument of confederation should be rent in pieces and scattered to the winds than that it should become a cloak for malice or a bond of iniquity. It is only as a security for just independent rights—and the noble charter of the Constitution is in letter and spirit all this—that we love the Union of the States and pray for its continuance.⁴⁸

Taking a similar stand, Bishop Lynch, who occupied John England's episcopacy in Charleston, in an open letter to Archbishop Hughes attributed the blame for southern secession to northern Yankees who "so shrewd in money matters" but "with inconceivable blindness, have originated, fostered, and propagated a fanatical party spirit which has brought about a result foretold from the beginning, both North and South, as the inevitable consequence of its success. Taking up anti-slavery making it into politics, they have broken up the Union." Insisting that the South had been forced to leave the Union to protect her own interests, he declared that the federal government should recognize secession as "fait accompli," and he urged his fellow Catholics in the North to let the "Black Republicans" do the fighting and not to "send Irishmen to die for a lost cause."⁴⁹

⁴⁸ *The Catholic Miscellany*, Mar. 2, 1861; also Bishop Quinlan's Pastoral on the Feast of Corpus Christi, *Metropolitan Record*, July 20, 1861; Quinlan to Dr. McCaffrey, the president of Mt. St. Mary's College, Meline and McSweeney, *op. cit.*, II, 7-8. Bishop Quinlan gave his blessing to rebel flags so that, fighting for a cause they believed just, the Confederates might "always conduct themselves as Christians". He reminded them at the same time that those fighting on the other side had the same right to ask and receive a blessing since the controversy was political in nature and each one was free to decide its justice for himself. *Catholic Mirror*, Oct. 12, 1861; Bishop Elder to McCaffrey, July, 1861, Meline and McSweeney, *op. cit.*, II, 8-9.

⁴⁹ *Metropolitan Record*, Sept. 7, 1861. Bishop Lynch had previously regarded secession as unfortunate. Tourscher, *op. cit.*, 458. He was later sent on a mission to France by Judah P. Benjamin. "Report of Bishop Lynch",

As might be expected the effect of all this among Catholics was to strengthen opposition to immediate mass emancipation, especially when such measures were undertaken by a hostile military power. Again, there was some distinction between the clerical and lay point of view. For the hierarchy and clergy, Bishop Verot probably set the pace when he exhorted the southern people to ameliorate the slave system.

It is undoubtedly true that the law of God does not reprove slavery; it is undoubtedly true that now the sudden and abrupt manumission of slaves would be a misfortune of appalling magnitude more so yet for the slave than for the master. Let then the wise and virtuous unite and combine their prudence, their patriotism, their humanity, and their religious integrity to divest slavery of the features which would make it odious to God and man. Now is the time to make a salutary reform, and to enact judicious regulations. I propose as a means of setting the new Confederacy upon a solid basis, that a servile code be drawn up and adopted by the Confederacy, defining clearly the rights and duties of slaves.⁵⁰

The impact of war upon the Catholic press of the South,

American Catholic Historical Researches, XXII, 248-259. While in Rome on this trip Bishop Lynch wrote a pamphlet expounding the southern position on emancipation. *Catholic Telegraph*, Dec. 21, 1864. For other clerical support of the Confederacy, see Michael Kenney, *Catholic Culture in Alabama*, 211; Garraghan, *op. cit.*, II, 154-155; Meline and McSweeney, *op. cit.*, II, 9-10; Abram Ryan, *Poems*, especially "The Sword of Robert E. Lee", 27-28, "The Conquered Banner", 96-101. Father Ryan was known as the "poet of the lost cause" for these and similar poems. See also John Magri "Catholicity in Virginia during the Episcopacy of Bishop McGill", *American Catholic Historical Review*, II, 422. An exception to this was Bishop James Whelan of Nashville, Tennessee. His strong Unionist sentiments alienated the support of his pro-Confederate flock. In 1864, Whelan resigned his see and retired to a monastery because he felt he could no longer be of use in Tennessee. Victor O'Daniel, *The Father of the Church in Tennessee, or the Life, Times and Character of the Right Reverend Richard Pius Miles, O.P.*, 373-374.

⁵⁰ *Freeman's Journal*, July 9, 1864. Bishop McGill of Richmond suggested reform of marriage abuses as necessary for the Confederacy to prosper and receive the blessing of God. McGill, *op. cit.*, 430-431. He described the war as a "scourge of God" for failure to protect these rights. See also Bishop Verot, Pastoral for the Jubilee of Pius IX, *Catholic Telegraph*, Nov. 8, 1865.

limited as it was anyway, was disastrous, and the Baltimore *Mirror* was the only one to survive the war period. Its editor, Courtney Jenkins, held pronounced proslavery views and was strongly sympathetic to the Confederacy. He consequently took upon himself the defense of southern interests against his northern co-religionists. Among these not even the Peace Democrat, McMaster of the *Freeman's Journal*, was satisfactory to Jenkins, while his distaste for Father Purcell of the *Catholic Telegraph* naturally increased rapidly as the Cincinnati editor veered closer to the antislavery party.⁵¹

Soon after the election of President Lincoln, Jenkins established the position to which he adhered throughout the war period:

Our personal interest in slavery is small, yet small as it is, we will agree in adopting such measures as are necessary to protect it, in common with others, against all outside influences; while at the same time, if the State of Maryland voluntarily abolishes slavery, we will yield to her act a cheerful acquiescence.⁵²

Having taken a fling at abolitionism, he declared:

The higher law would impel us only to mitigate the ills which rest upon the condition of slavery; to provide as far as lies within us for the spiritual and temporal wants of the slaves; and it would even forbid our emancipating them without some reasonable assurance that their condition would not become in consequence worse than while in slavery—a thing of by no means uncommon occurrence.⁵³

Proposed emancipation measures during the war found the *Mirror* increasingly critical. When plans were under way for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia by Con-

⁵¹ *Catholic Mirror*, Aug. 31, 1861, Nov. 23, 1863, for samples of Jenkins' tilts with northern journalists. A sharp criticism of Brownson's review of the Cochin book appeared in the issue of Oct. 5, 1861.

⁵² *Catholic Mirror*, Dec. 1, 1860.

⁵³ *Ibid.*

gressional action Jenkins appealed to the president to check this "first born" of the "baleful political progeny" of abolitionism, describing it as an opening wedge in the war on the Constitution and on the rights of free white men.⁵⁴ In succeeding editorials he pointed out the disastrous effects which sudden emancipation would have upon the white worker, and contrasted the iniquities of such a plan with the wisdom and justice of the Catholic tradition.⁵⁵

Immediately after the preliminary announcement of the Emancipation Proclamation the vitriolic condemnatory editorial from the *Metropolitan Record* was reprinted in the *Mirror*.⁵⁶ After the Proclamation had become official Jenkins matched this with some comments of his own.

Utterly impotent as a measure of good, this proclamation comes to us freighted with unmingled evil. 'Tis the culminating act of a policy which disarms the law of its beneficence, and batters down the constitutional guaranties which alone give security to the States, and dignity—the dignity of freemen—to the citizen. It compresses all the functions of government into the narrow space of an individual will. Considered in its motive, it contemplates the triumph of a fanatical and reckless faction. Regarded in its anticipated results, it is an invitation to servile insurrection. Its assumptions of power are surpassed in enormity only by the horrors and atrocities it covertly counsels. While invoking the "considerate judgment of mankind and the gracious favor of Almighty God", in its principles, it defies the civilization of the age and suggests crimes which are hideous mockeries of God's goodness and providence. Proclaimed as an act necessary to suppress rebellion against the authority and government of the United States, it raises issues and professes objects utterly subversive of legitimate authority, and at variance with the permanence of free institutions.⁵⁷

⁵⁴ April 19, 1862.

⁵⁵ May 10, July 5, 1862.

⁵⁶ Oct. 11, 1862.

⁵⁷ Jan. 10, 1863.

The subsequent editorial policy of the paper showed it unreconciled to such exercise of federal power and darkly pessimistic as to the future of the nation and of the southern states.⁵⁸

The few instances of support among southern Catholics for mass emancipation of the slave population were exceptional and need hardly be considered.⁵⁹ For the great majority, sectional interest combined with the teaching of their spiritual leaders and the tradition of their church to arouse their opposition to an immediate and sudden abolition of the slave system, while the devotion to their beloved Southland which they shared with their Protestant brethren made them increasingly intent upon refuting the northern assault.

58 See also "A Priest of Kentucky", *Catholic Telegraph*, July 1, Dec. 23, 1863. J. J. O'Connell, *op. cit.*, 465, for an argument in support of the legitimacy of the southern constitutional claims and the belief that the war was unnecessary to destroy slavery, which "was an evil", and "would eventually have destroyed itself by territorial limitation."

59 Father Claude Maistre of New Orleans was suspended by Archbishop Odin for violent sermons against the white race and in support of abolition. Roger Baudier, *The Catholic Church in Louisiana*, 413. See also a letter from a New Orleans Catholic supporter. *Catholic Telegraph*, Sept. 16, 1863. Even the German settlers in Texas, who like their Protestant compatriots, held no slaves, refrained from public reflection on the slave system. These Germans devoted themselves to raising "free cotton" and other crops but they realized that it was important from the point of view of their own well being in the community to keep out of the slavery controversy. G. H. Benjamin, "Germans in Texas", *German-American Annals*, X, 315-340, XI, 3-33, 103-160, 164-176, 208-232, 235-256; F. L. Olmstead, *A Journey through Texas*, 138-148, 169-237, 428-441.

CONCLUSION

THE Catholic Church, holding that no fundamental tenet of Catholicism was involved in the slavery controversy, refrained from taking an absolute, dogmatic position. According to its long established teaching, human bondage was not morally wrong *per se* provided the conditions laid down by theologians as necessary for a "just servitude" were observed. In other respects adherents of the Church in the United States were free to follow their own inclinations in approaching the question—a fact which explains the sectional and intra-sectional divergence which developed among them.

In the South, community custom and thought were important in conditioning the relationship of Catholics to the slave system. True, there were certain ethical and religious problems involved in the ownership of slaves. In this regard there was theoretically a definite church doctrine but the practical application of such teaching was dependent upon a variety of extraneous circumstances. In his attitude towards the "peculiar institution" and in the management of his slaves the average Catholic differed not at all from his Protestant neighbor.

Analysis of Catholic opinion in the North reveals a wider range of thought. With the exception of outright abolitionism the various gradations of northern sentiment found expression within the church fold. On the one side was a Carey or a Broderick to challenge the continuance of the slave system, and, during the war years, a Brownson or a Purcell to take up the cudgels for emancipation. On the other side was an O'Connor or a Mullaly to furnish the positive proslavery defense. At the same time the traditional policy of the Catholic Church on the subject of human bondage together with conditions peculiar to the Catholic community encouraged a certain unity of approach. The first accounts for the absence of any challenge to the right of church members to hold property in slaves. Both help to explain the opposition to abolitionism so common among them.

Spokesmen for Catholicism, overlooking the economic and social factors responsible for the decline of slavery in Europe, attributed the abandonment of the system there to the influence of the Christian Church. From reasons of expediency as well as of conviction they argued that such a policy would be equally effective in the United States, and they opposed the use of the more positive instrumentalities suggested by the advocates of immediacy. Significant of this predominant opinion was the pastoral letter issued from the Plenary Council which assembled at Baltimore in 1866. Urging clergy and laity to cooperate in plans to extend to the recently freed Negroes that "Christian education and moral restraint" of which they stood so much in need, the hierarchical pronouncement continued:

We could have wished, that in accordance with the action of the Catholic Church in past ages, in regard to the serfs of Europe, a more gradual system of emancipation could have been adopted, so that they might have been in some measure prepared to make a better use of their freedom, than they are likely to do now. Still, the evils which must necessarily attend upon the sudden liberation of so large a multitude with their peculiar dispositions and habits, only make the appeal to our Christian charity and zeal, presented by their forlorn condition, the more forcible and imperative.¹

Other influences contributed to the dislike of the methods and agents of abolitionism. In the Old World, the church was on the defensive against "liberalism, Marxism, anti-clericalism, and secularization."² The American hierarchy was predominantly European in origin, and its ties with that continent, then making a substantial contribution in money and personnel to the American mission field, were close. Individual members, inclined to view conditions here from a European vantage point,

¹ Pastoral Letter of the 2nd Plenary Council of Baltimore, P. G. Mode, *Sourcebook of American Church History*, 475; J. L. Spalding, *The Life of the Most Reverend M. J. Spalding*, 298-299, 465; L. A. Dutto, "Negroes in Mississippi", *Catholic World*, XLVI, 583-584.

² C. J. H. Hayes, *A Generation of Materialism*, 142.

were apt to link the leaders of the American reform movements with the much disliked " Revolutionaries " and " Red Republicans " of the Old World.

All this generated a spirit of conservatism towards domestic problems. Particularly was this true of the clergy, many of whom were unduly alarmed over the prospect of social chaos anticipated as the inevitable accompaniment of any sudden emancipation of the Negroes. Others, attributing much that was askew in the world from their point of view to private judgment in matters of religion, found ample justification for their attitude in the schisms precipitated within the Protestant sects by the slavery issue. The presence of active leaders of the " Protestant Crusade " in the councils of abolitionism together with Catholic mistrust of contemporary Utopianism tended to increase their dislike of abolitionists as of other reformers.

Nationalist predispositions of church members not yet assimilated to the American tradition entered into the situation. Irishmen, obsessed with the idea that no nation had so suffered as had theirs at the hands of England, viewed with small favor the interest shown by British antislavery groups in the American domestic problem, a bias which has colored the views of Irish-Americans on other occasions. It was sufficient in this instance to turn them against proposals emanating from a source tainted by contact with John Bull. The sympathies of German Catholics were similarly alienated by the participation of rationalist and free-thinking *émigrés* in abolitionist activity.

The affiliation of the Catholic citizenry with the Democratic Party likewise played a part in strengthening opposition to immediate abolition and to federal interference in matters regarded as objects of state regulation. In short, as is common among the regulars of any political organization, because they were Democrats they adopted the views of that party on the slavery issue. In economic affairs the interest of the Catholic portion of the population lay predominantly with the laboring class, a fact which was responsible for considerable antagonism towards Negroes with the approach of emancipation.

Community custom and thought, the conservative tradition of the Church, dislike of abolitionism, the affiliation of so many Catholics with the Democratic Party, the immigrant status of the church membership, each of these contributed in some measure to influence the tenor of Catholic opinion. Important also was the position of the hierarchy, most of whom agreed that slavery was a domestic problem, jurisdiction over which belonged to the states where the slave system was an established institution. Suspicion of centralized authority was in part responsible for this attitude. Stemming in all probability from European conflicts between Church and State, it has helped to give Catholic social thought in this country a pronounced state rights bias.

Out of all this there had crystalized by 1860 a "Catholic position," unofficial in character, but which commanded, nevertheless, the adherence of the majority of the church membership. It rested first upon the theological argument which denied that slavery was intrinsically wrong. It recognized the existence of evils in the slave system which made eventual emancipation desirable, but it held that such emancipation should come gradually and with due regard for the welfare of society and the protection of the property rights of the owners. Finally, it condemned abolitionism absolutely, both for its methods and for its associations.

In spite of conservative church tradition and dislike of abolitionism there were during the pre-war years few Catholics who actively defended Negro slavery as a positive good. The approach of sectional conflict, however, brought out more positive proslavery sentiment, especially in the religious press. This was unfortunate from any angle but more particularly because it gave to the Catholic community an appearance of unanimity in opposition to emancipation which seems unwarranted from the evidence at hand. Editorial opinion in papers like the *Freeman's Journal*, the *Metropolitan Record*, the *Baltimore Mirror*, was generally regarded as indicative of the official opinion of the Church, an impression which was heightened by the pontifi-

cal tone of the editors in setting forth the case against emancipation. This is a problem in public relations which has plagued American Catholicism from time to time through the years.³

Throughout the course of the slavery controversy ecclesiastical leaders insisted upon the official neutrality of the Church. The church councils and synods of the period, in keeping with the policy of avoiding political discussions on such occasions, confined their deliberations to "morals, and discipline of the church."⁴ Quite aside from the possible merits of such a policy, it presented an obvious anomaly to participation by individual churchmen in the question at issue. Unfortunately such spokesmen, in their efforts to combat abolitionism and to disassociate the church membership from any connection with it, went to considerable lengths in their defense of slavery. Bishop England's *Letters on Domestic Slavery*, Archbishop Kenrick's counsel to the clergy in his *Theologia Moralis*, Archbishop Hughes' diatribe against Brownson, each of these seemed to give ecclesiastical sanction to the slave system and in so doing contributed to the proslavery argument. The views expressed on these occasions were individual rather than *ex cathedra* but it was naturally difficult for non-Catholics—or indeed for the ignorant immigrant population—to distinguish between the Church *per se* and its representatives.

The American Catholic hierarchy, with a few notable exceptions, has not been distinguished for farsighted or courageous leadership in social or economic problems. During the years of the slavery discussions members of the hierarchy by taking refuge in a conservative church tradition, entirely remote from the contemporary issue, contributed to the general impression that their church was proslavery. They helped also to retard the development of a constructive Catholic approach to the slavery issue and encouraged the persistence among their fol-

³ A recent example is the anti-Semitic and isolationist activity of the Coughlinite press.

⁴ Archbishop Spalding, quoted in J. L. Spalding, *Life of the Most Reverend M. J. Spalding*, 238.

lowers of racial and nationalist antipathies which had no place upon the American scene.

The belief that Catholics were proslavery in sentiment was apparently fairly widespread in the North. It showed itself in the strictures aimed at the Roman Church by leading anti-slavery spokesmen. It was very evident during the Know-Nothing campaign, and it had its echo after the war in charges that a prelate like John Hughes had made no attempt "to instruct or influence in favor of the liberty of four millions of chattels" the "vast body of ignorant men and women who so hung on his words."⁵

The same opinion prevailed in the South. There, charges of antislavery sympathy were directed at recent immigrants rather than at the native Catholic population which had long been established in Maryland and Louisiana, the two centers of southern Catholicism. John England's apologia for slavery won the plaudits of South Carolinians, and deservedly so, for it provided Catholics with an effective proslavery argument. Some years later when Know-Nothingism was at its height, Alexander Stephens wrote of Catholics:

they have never warred against us or our peculiar institutions. No man can say as much of New England Baptists, Presbyterians or Methodists; the long roll of abolition petitions, with which Congress has been so agitated for past years, come not from the Catholics; their pulpits at the North are not desecrated every Sabbath with anathemas against slavery. And of the three thousand New England clergymen who sent the anti-Nebraska memorial to the Senate, not one was a Catholic . . .⁶

The public utterances of Catholic bishops and priests in the South did nothing to betray such expressions of confidence. The most forthright Catholic challenge to the slave system in

⁵ *Nation*, Nov. 30, 1865, 691-692. For an expression of this opinion as to Irish Catholics specifically, see *New York Tribune*, Aug. 26, 1854.

⁶ Quoted in W. G. Bean, "An Aspect of Know-Nothingism—the Immigrant and Slavery", *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, XXIII, 333. See also *ibid.*, 333, n. 50.

the pre-war period came from a layman, Judge Gaston of North Carolina, a state notable for the persistence of antislavery sentiment.

Unlike the great Protestant denominations, the Catholic Church experienced no sectional division on the slavery issue. Its members fought on both sides during the war, there was a certain amount of controversial correspondence between northern and southern ecclesiastics, and there were brisk passages at arms between the religious journals of the respective sections. Obviously, there was in the main little reason for sectional bitterness or continued animosity, and within a year after the close of hostilities the hierarchy of the nation gathered at Baltimore for the Second Plenary Council of the Church in the United States. Northern and southern bishops joined in the appeal for attention to the needs of the recently emancipated Negroes which was included in the pastoral letter issued from the Council.

Catholic writers frequently attribute the absence of schism in their church to the conservatism of its position. The organization of the Catholic Church is such, however, as to permit sharp differences among its members on matters not involving questions of faith or morals. In such circumstances, sectional division would seem unlikely even in the face of more pronounced disagreement over slavery. It is possible that such apologists attach to the conservatism of Catholic policy undue credit for the maintenance of unity.

There is an obvious challenge to this "Catholic position" which comes readily to mind. In falling back upon the traditional policy of their church, were not Catholic leaders evading what was actually a moral issue, made so by the conflict between the inequities of the slave system and the rights of the slave as a human being? One would think that human slavery was a moral question in just the same way that the right of the worker to a living wage, decent working conditions, and security for his family is a moral question. A similar failure to come to grips with the realities of the economic order was causing

during the same period in Europe an alarming drift of the masses away from Catholicism. Leo XIII, who ascended to the papal throne in 1878, did much to check this drift by the positive and constructive interpretation which he gave to Catholic social thought during the many years of his pontificate. It is perhaps significant that Leo, in a letter to the bishops of Brazil, likewise gave forthright papal condemnation to human bondage.⁷

Equally a moral question was the problem of racial relationships involved in Negro slavery. According to Catholic social philosophy violation of the basic human rights to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" is sinful.⁸ The Catholic Church as a "living union of all mankind" can recognize no racial discrimination but insists rather that these natural rights are "created with man and inherent in him" by virtue of the common origin and destiny of all men as members of the Mystical Body of Christ.⁹ Consequently, the theory of racial inequality implicit in the proslavery argument would seem contrary to the teachings of Catholicism and deserving of condemnation as a moral wrong.¹⁰

The inability of the Catholic Church to carry on effective missionary work among the slaves prior to the Civil War hampered its relations with the freedmen in the post-war period. In spite of creditable accomplishments in more recent years the Catholic body as a whole has been slow to appreciate its full responsibility in this respect.¹¹ This is a condition of affairs upon which the timidity of the pre-war approach to the Negro question may have had some bearing, just as it may have encouraged Irish Catholics to resist the draft because of their re-

⁷ Leo XIII, *To the Bishops of Brazil on the Church and Slavery*.

⁸ John LaFarge, *Interracial Justice*, 189.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 173, 60.

¹⁰ The whole question of Catholicism and race relations is well treated in LaFarge, *op. cit.*

¹¹ J. T. Gillard, *Colored Catholics in the United States*, 256.

luctance to fight to free the slaves and permitted an irresponsible press to play upon the racial antagonism of its readers.

In spite of the exhortations of the Council of 1866, no national organized effort among the Negroes was attempted until 1884 when the National Commission for Indians and Negroes was established with Cardinal Gibbons as chairman.¹² This delay was the more serious because the poverty-stricken southern dioceses, with their small Catholic population and handicapped by the ravages of war, were desperately in need of assistance in their new field of activity.

A student of contemporary American Catholicism has recently written:

Yes, there may be a "Christian Front" in this country, begotten of anti-Semitism, Nazism and the depression, but there is no "Catholic Front". Possibly this is regrettable. It is not difficult to imagine that if half a dozen Bishops as farseeing and intelligent as the prelate who now rules over Father Coughlin's diocese were to rally Catholic opinion in support of objectives which in these dark days are identifiable with the defense of civilization, the nation and indeed the whole world would benefit. Yet one may well doubt that the time is ripe for any such move. It would in all likelihood succeed only if Catholic opinion had been marshalled by an alert and vigorous journalism fully abreast of the times. Even the rudiments of such a journalism do not exist. What the Catholic press reflects at this hour is the state of mind of small groups, of isolated communities, of intellects which push conformism to the verge of absurdity. Nothing could, therefore, be a worse blunder than to identify American Catholicism with any of the "movements" we have been describing. These merely demonstrate that American Catholicism has not attained self-consciousness.¹³

12 R. J. Murphy, "The Catholic Church in the United States during the Civil War Period", *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, XXXIX, 337-341. See also Gillard, *op. cit.*, and *The Catholic Church and the American Negro*.

13 G. N. Shuster, "The Conflict among Catholics", *The American Scholar*, X, No. 1, 16.

If one may interpret "self-consciousness" to mean the acceptance of responsibility as Catholics to take a constructive, positive stand in meeting social problems, this was all the more true in the period of the slavery controversy. At that stage in its development American Catholicism was far from approaching "self-consciousness." It was a mission church, the great body of whose members were poor, uneducated, and new comers to the country. The Catholic press, less provincial perhaps than it is today, displayed nevertheless little national vision and it labored under a persecution complex which influenced the discussions of almost every issue. Effective lay leadership was lacking. Members of the clergy and hierarchy who might have pointed the way for a devoted congregation were busy with pressing church affairs, unaware of or indifferent to the full implications of the slavery issue, and too conservative in attitude to develop a positive approach to the question.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

I. UNPUBLISHED

- Carroll Papers, Cathedral Archives, Baltimore, Md.
Hughes Papers, St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, N. Y.
Mobberly, Joseph, *Diary*, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.

II. CONTEMPORARY NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES

- Catholic Advocate*, Bardstown, Ky., 1836-1848.
Catholic Herald and Visitor, Philadelphia, 1837-1841, 1857-1863.
Catholic Mirror, Baltimore, 1850-1865.
The Citizen, New York, 1854-1855.
Catholic Telegraph, Cincinnati, 1831-36, 1842, 1847, 1862-1865.
Freeman's Journal, New York, 1842-1865.
Guardian, Louisville, Ky., 1858-1861.
The Irish News, New York, 1856-58, 1860.
The Metropolitan, a Monthly Magazine, Devoted to Religion, Education, Literature and General Information, Baltimore, 1853-1858.
Metropolitan Record, New York, 1859-1863.
The Nation, 1865.
New York Tablet, 1857-1862.
New York Tribune, 1854.
Pilot, Boston, 1830-1865.
Pittsburgh Catholic, 1846-1863.
St. Louis Leader, 1855, Dec. 27, 1856.
United States Catholic Miscellany, Charleston, S. C., 1831-1849, 1860-1861.

III. PUBLISHED

- Aquinas, Thomas, *Summa Theologica*, London, 1911-1925, 19 vols.
Augustine, *The City of God*. Select Library of the Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, II. Edited by Philipp Schaff. Translated by Marcus Dods, New York, 1907.
Balmes, Jaime E., *Protestantism and Catholicity Compared in their Effects on the Civilization of Europe*, Baltimore, 1854.
Blakely, Paul S., "The Alleged Child Labor Amendment," *America*, March 10, 1934, 544-546.
Brownson, Orestes, *Works*, edited by Henry F. Brownson, Detroit, 1884, 20 vols.
Buckingham, James, *The Slave States of America*, London, 1842, 2 vols.
Calhoun, John C., *Works*, New York, 1854, 6 vols.
Carey, Henry C., *The Slave Trade Domestic and Foreign*, Philadelphia, 1853.
Carey, Mathew, *Letters on the Colonization Society*, Philadelphia, 1832.

- , *Miscellaneous Essays*, Philadelphia, 1830.
- Carroll, John, "Reply to Rev. Patrick Smyth", *American Catholic Historical Researches*, XXII, 193-266.
- Channing, William E., *Slavery*, Boston, 1836.
- Church Action on Slavery*, A report on the Presbyterian Church in New York (n. d.).
- Cochin, Augustin, *The Results of Slavery*, Boston, 1863.
- Congressional Globe*, Washington, D. C.
- Du Lac, Perrin, *Travels through the Two Louisianas and among the Savage Nations of the Missouri*; also, *In the United States, along the Ohio and the Adjacent Provinces, in 1801, 1802, and 1803*, London, 1807.
- Doupanloup, Felix Antoine Philbert, "Pastoral Letter to His Clergy on the Subject of the Civil War in the U. S., April 6, 1862." *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, XXV, 18-29.
- England, John, *Works*, Edited by Ignatius Reynolds, Baltimore, 1849, 5 vols.
- , *Letters to the Hon. John Forsyth on the Subject of Domestic Slavery* to which are prefixed copies in Latin and English of the Pope's Apostolic Letter Concerning the African Slave Trade with some Introductory Remarks, etc. by W. George Read, Baltimore, 1844.
- French, B. F., *Historical Collections of Louisiana*, New York, 1851, 5 vols.
- Fuller, Richard and Wayland, Francis, *Domestic Slavery Considered as a Scriptural Institution*, New York, 1845.
- Gayarré, Charles, "Louisiana Sugar Plantation of the Old Régime", *Harper's New Monthly Magazine*, March, 1887, 606-621.
- Gibbons, James, *Our Christian Heritage*, Baltimore, 1889.
- Grassi, John, "The Catholic Religion in United States in 1818", *American Catholic Historical Researches*, VIII, 98-111.
- Guilday, Peter, *The National Pastorals of the American Hierarchy, 1792-1919*, Washington, D. C., 1923.
- Guthrie, William D., *The Child Labor Amendment*, Argument in Opposition to Ratification Prepared for Submission to the Legislature of the State of New York, New York, 1934.
- , *The Federal Government and Education*, Columbus, Ohio, 1920.
- Hamilton, Thomas, *Men and Manners in America*, London, 1833, 2 vols.
- Hedding, Elizah, *The Substance of an Address on the Rights and Duties of the President of an Annual Conference; on the Rights and Duties of such a Conference; and on the Principles and History of said Church on the Act of Holding Slaves*, New York, 1838.
- Howlett, W. J., "Bishop Flaget's Diary", *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, XXIX, 36-59, 152-169, 231-249.
- Hughes, John, *Complete Works*, edited by Lawrence Kehoe, New York, 1865, 2 vols.
- Jefferson, Thomas, *Writings*, Washington, D. C., 1907, 20 vols. in 10.
- Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*, edited by Reuben Gold Thwaites, Cleveland, 1896-1901, 73 vols.
- Johnson, R. M., "The Georgia Negro Before, During, and Since the War", *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, VI, 353-367.

- Kelly, John, *Speech Delivered in the House of Representatives* on Tuesday, Feb. 10, 1857, in Reply to Hon. Henry Winter Davis of Maryland, Washington, 1857.
- Kenrick, Francis P., *Pastoral Letter of 1858*, Baltimore (n. d.).
- , *Theologia Moralis*, Baltimore, 1861, 2 vols.
- The Kenrick-Frenaye Correspondence*, edited by F. E. T. (Tourscher), Philadelphia, 1920.
- Labat, Jean Baptiste, *Voyages Aux Isles de l'Amérique* (Antilles) 1693-1705, Paris, 1931, 2 vols.
- LaFarge, John, *Interracial Justice: A Study of the Catholic Doctrine of Race Relations*, New York, 1937.
- Letter of an Adopted Catholic* addressed to the President of the Kentucky Democratic Association of Washington City, on Temporal Allegiance to the Pope and the Relations of the Catholic Church and Catholics both Native and Adopted, to the System of Domestic Slavery and its Agitation in the United States, Washington, 1856.
- "Letters Concerning some Missions of the Mississippi Valley", *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, XIV, 141-216.
- Leo XIII, *To the Bishops of Brazil on the Church and Slavery*, Baltimore, 1888.
- Lyell, Sir Charles, *A Second Visit to the United States of America*, London, 1849, 2 vols.
- Lynch, Patrick N., "Reports of Bishop Lynch of Charleston, South Carolina, Commissioner of the Confederate States to the Holy See", *American Catholic Historical Researches*, XXII, 248-259.
- McGill, John, *Our Faith the Victory* or a Comprehensive View of the Principal Doctrines of the Christian Religion, Baltimore, 1865.
- McGovern, James J., *The Life and Letters of Eliza Allen Starr*, Chicago, 1905.
- Member of the Sodality of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Church of the Holy Redeemer, East Boston, *The Influence of Catholic Doctrine on the Emancipation of Slaves*, 1863.
- Mayo, A. D., *Herod, John and Jesus: or American Slavery and its Christian Cure*, Albany, 1860.
- Mode, Peter G., *Source Book of American Church History*, Manasha, 1921.
- The Negro Pew*, Being an Inquiry concerning the Propriety of Distinctions in the House of God, on account of Color, Boston, 1837.
- Nichols, Thomas L., *Forty Years of American Life*, New York, 1937.
- North Carolina Reports*.
- O'Connell, J. J., *Catholicity in the Carolinas and Georgia: Leaves of Its History*, New York, 1879.
- O'Connell, William, "The Reasonable Limits of State Activity", *Catholic Education Review*, Nov., 1919, 513-527.
- O'Connor, Charles, *Negro Slavery Not Unjust*, Speech at the Union Meeting at the Academy of Music, New York City, Dec. 19, 1859, New York, 1859.
- Official Opinions of the Attorneys General of the United States*, Washington, D. C.

- Olmstead, Frederick L., *The Cotton Kingdom*, New York, 1862, 2 vols.
- , *A Journey Through Texas, or a Saddle-Trip on the Southwestern Frontier*, New York, 1860.
- Parker, Theodore, *The Slave Power*, edited by James K. Hosmer, Boston, 1908.
- Peck, George, *Slavery and the Episcopacy*; being an examination of Dr. Bascom's Review of the Reply of the Majority to the Protest of the Minority of the Late Conference of the M. E. Church in the Case of Bishop Andrew, New York, 1845.
- Phillips, Ulrich B., *Plantation and Frontier Documents*, Cleveland, 1909, 2 vols.
- The Pope's Bull and the Words of Daniel O'Connell*, New York, 1856.
- The Pro-Slavery Argument*; as maintained by the Most Distinguished Writers of the Southern States, Containing the Several Essays of Chancellor Harper, Governor Hammond, Dr. Simms, and Professor Dew, Charleston, 1852.
- Raphael, M. J., *Bible View of Slavery*, A Discourse Delivered at the Jewish Synagogue, "Bnai Jeshurum", New York, on the Day of the National Fast, Jan. 4, 1861, New York, 1861.
- "La Race Negre", *Revue Du Monde Catholique*, I, 78-88, 278-286, 649-668, Paris, 1861.
- Rowland, Henry A., *The Church and Slavery*; or the Relations of the Churches to Slavery under the Constitution; Considered with Special Reference to the Constitutionality of the Action of the General Assembly at Buffalo, A. D. 1853, New York, 1854.
- Ryan, Abram J., *Poems: Patriotic, Religious, Miscellaneous*, Baltimore, 1884.
- Ryan, John A., "The Proposed Child Labor Amendment", *Catholic World*, CXX, 166-174.
- , *Social Doctrine in Action*, New York, 1941.
- Spalding, Martin J., *Miscellanea*: Comprising Reviews, Lectures, and Essays on Historical, Theological, and Miscellaneous Subjects, Baltimore, 1875.
- , *Sketches of Kentucky*, 1844.
- "Taney, Roger B. to Samuel Nott", *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, XII, 444-447.
- Thebaud, Augustus J., *Forty Years in the United States, 1839-1885*, edited by C. G. Herberman, New York, 1904.
- Thompson, Joseph P., *Teachings of the New Testament on Slavery*, New York, 1856.
- Thorpe, T. B., "Sugar and the Sugar Region of Louisiana", *Harper's Magazine*, VII, 746-767, 1853.
- United States Reports of Cases argued and adjudged in the Supreme Court of the U. S.*
- "United States Commissioner of Education, Special Report, 1871", *House Executive Documents*, XIII.
- Walsh, Robert, *An Appeal from the Judgments of Great Britain Respecting the United States of America*, London, 1819.
- , *Free Remarks on the Spirit of the Federal Constitution, the Practice of the Federal Government, and the Obligations of the Union, Respecting*

the Exclusion of Slavery from the Territories and New States, Philadelphia, 1819.

Wimpffen, François Alexandre, Baron de, *Voyage à Saint-Domingue, Pendant les Années, 1788, 1789, 1890*, Paris, 1797, 2 vols.

IV. SECONDARY SOURCES

Aimes, Hubert H., *A History of Slavery in Cuba, 1511-1868*, New York, 1907.

Allard, Paul, *Esclaves, Serfs et Mainmortables*, Paris, 1894.

Andrews, Rena, *Archbishop Hughes and the Civil War*, University of Chicago, 1935.

Ashley, Winston, *The Theory of Natural Slavery, According to Aristotle and St. Thomas*, Notre Dame University, South Bend, Indiana, 1941.

Bancroft, Frederick, *Slave Trading in the Old South*, Baltimore, 1931.

Barnes, Gilbert, *The Antislavery Impulse, 1830-1844*, New York, 1933.

Bassett, John Spencer, *Slavery in the State of North Carolina* (Johns Hopkins University Studies, Series XVII, No. 7-8), Baltimore, 1899.

Baudier, Roger, *The Catholic Church in Louisiana*, New Orleans, 1939.

Bean, William G., "An Aspect of Know-Nothingism—The Immigrant and Slavery", *South Atlantic Quarterly*, XXIII, 319-334.

Benjamin, Gilbert G., "Germans in Texas", *German American Annals*, X, 315-340, XI, 3-33, 103-120, 164-176, 208-232, 235-256.

Billington, Ray A., *The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860*, New York, 1938.

Blegen, Theodore C., *Norwegian Migration to America*, Northfield, Minn., 1940, 2 vols.

Brackett, Jeffrey R., *The Negro in Maryland, A Study of the Institution of Slavery*, Baltimore, 1889.

Brownlow, W. R., *Lectures on Slavery and Serfdom in Europe*, London, 1892.

Butsch, Joseph, "Negro Catholics in the United States", *Catholic Historical Review*, III, 33-51.

—, "Catholics and the Negro", *Journal of Negro History*, II, 392-410.

Cambridge Medieval History, New York, 1911, 8 vols.

M. A. C., "The Church of the Attakapas—1770-1889", *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, XIX, 462-487.

Carlyle, R. W. and A. J., *A History of Medieval Political Theory in the West*, New York, 1903, 2 vols.

Carman, Harry J. and Luthin, Reinhard H., "Some Aspects of the Know-Nothing Movement Reconsidered", *South Atlantic Quarterly*, XXXIX, 212-234.

Catholic Encyclopedia, New York, 1913, 16 vols.

Catterall, Helen T., *Judicial Cases Concerning American Slavery and the Negro*, Washington, 1932, 6 vols.

Cavanagh, Michael, *Memoirs of General Thomas Francis Meagher, Comprising the Leading Events of His Career. Chronologically Arranged with Selections from His Speeches, Lectures and Miscellaneous Writings, Including Personal Reminiscences*, Worcester, 1892.

"Christianity Versus Slavery", *The Catholic Mind*, April 7, 1921, 128-136.

- Clarke, Richard H., "A Noted Pioneer Convert of New England", *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, Jan., 1904, 138-166.
- Clarkson, Thomas, *Of the Rise, Progress, and Accomplishment of the Abolition of the African Slave-Trade by the British Parliament*, New York, 1836, 3 vols.
- Code, Joseph B., "A Colored Catholic Educator Before the Civil War", *Catholic World*, CXLIV, 437-443.
- Cole, Arthur C., "Nativism in the Lower Mississippi Valley", *Mississippi Valley Historical Association Proceedings*, VI, 258-273.
- Commager, Henry Steele, *Theodore Parker*, Boston, 1936.
- Craven, Avery, *The Coming of the Civil War*, New York, 1942.
- Crouse, Nellis M., *French Pioneers in the West Indies*, New York, 1940.
- Curley, Michael J., *Church and State in the Spanish Floridas (1783-1822)*. (Studies in American Church History, Catholic University of America, XXX), Washington, D. C.
- Dabney, Virginus, *Liberalism in the South*, Chapel Hill, N. C., 1932.
- De Courcy, Henry, *Catholic Church in the United States*, A Sketch of its Ecclesiastical History Translated and Enlarged by J. G. Shea, New York, 1856.
- Deiler, J. Hanno, "The Settlement of the German Coast of Louisiana and the Creoles of German Descent", *German American Annals*, XI, 34-63, 67-102, 123-163, 179-207.
- Dessalles, M. Adrien, *Histoire Générale des Antilles*, Paris, 1847.
- Dictionary of American Biography*, New York, 1928-1936, 20 vols.
- Dictionnaire Apologétique de la Foi Catholique*, Paris, 1913.
- Dillon, William, *Life of John Mitchel*, London, 1888, 2 vols.
- Dodd, William E., *The Cotton Kingdom. A Chronicle of the Old South*, New Haven, 1919.
- Dumond, Dwight, *Anti-Slavery Origins of the Civil War*, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1939.
- Dunbar-Nelson, Alice, "People of Color in Louisiana", *Journal of Negro History*, I, 361-376; II, 51-78.
- Du Bois, W. E., Burghardt, *Black Reconstruction*, New York, 1935.
- Dutto, L. A., "Negroes in Mississippi", *Catholic World*, XLVI, 575-588.
- Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, New York, 1930-1935, 15 vols.
- Flanders, Ralph B., *Plantation Slavery in Georgia*, Chapel Hill, N. C., 1933.
- Fortier, Alcée, *History of Louisiana*, New York, 1904, 4 vols.
- Fox, Early L., *The American Colonization Society*, Baltimore, 1919.
- Frese, Joseph R., *Catholic Opinion and Secession, 1860-1861*. Unpublished M. A. Thesis at Georgetown University, 1939.
- Garraghan, Gilbert J., *The Jesuits of the Middle United States*, New York, 1938, 3 vols.
- , *The Catholic Church in Chicago, 1673-1871*, Chicago, 1921.
- Gayarré, Charles, *History of Louisiana*, New Orleans, 1903, 4 vols.
- Garrison, W. P. and F. J., *William Lloyd Garrison, 1805-1879. The Story of His Life Told by His Children*, New York, 1882-1889, 4 vols.
- Gillard, John T., *The Catholic Church and the American Negro*, Baltimore, 1929.

- , *Colored Catholics in the United States*, Baltimore, 1941.
- Gray, Louis C., *History of Agriculture in the Southern United States to 1860*, Washington, 1933, 2 vols.
- Guilday, Peter, *A History of the Councils of Baltimore, 1791-1884*, New York, 1932.
- , *Life and Times of John Carroll*, New York, 1922, 2 vols.
- , *Life and Times of John England*, New York, 1927, 2 vols.
- , "The Priesthood of Colonial Maryland", *The Ecclesiastical Review*, Jan., 1934, 14-31.
- Hart, Albert B., *Slavery and Abolition, 1831-1841*, New York, 1906.
- Hassard, J. R. G., *Life of John Hughes*, First Archbishop of New York, With Extracts from his Private Correspondence, New York, 1866.
- Hayes, Carlton J. H., *A Generation of Materialism, 1871-1900*, New York, 1941.
- Helps, Sir Arthur, *Spanish Conquest in America*, London, 1855, 4 vols.
- Huggins, Willis N., *The Contribution of the Catholic Church to the Progress of the Negro in the United States*. A doctoral dissertation at Fordham University, 1932.
- Ingram, John K., *A History of Slavery and Serfdom*, London, 1895.
- Jackson, Luther, "Religious Instruction of Negroes 1830-1860 with Special Reference to South Carolina", *Journal of Negro History*, XV, 72-114.
- Jarrett, Bede, *Social Theories of the Middle Ages*, Westminster, Md., 1942.
- Jenkins, William S., *Pro-Slavery Thought in the Old South*, Chapel Hill, N. C., 1935.
- Jonkers, E. J., "De L'Influence Du Christianisme Sur La Legislation Relative à l'Esclavage Dans L'Antiquité", *Mnemosyne Bibliotheca Classica Batava*, 3rd Series, I, 241-280.
- Kendall, John, "New Orleans' Peculiar Institution", *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, XXIII, 864-886.
- Kenny, Michael, *Catholic Culture in Alabama*, New York, 1931.
- Lloyd, Arthur J., *The Slavery Controversy*, Chapel Hill, N. C., 1939.
- Lochemes, Sister M. Frederick, *Robert Walsh, His Story*, New York, 1941.
- Lunn, Arnold, *A Saint in the Slave Trade, Peter Claver*, London (n. d.).
- Lyons, Adelaide, "Religious Defense of Slavery in the North", *Historical Papers of Trinity College Historical Society*, XIII, 5-34.
- MacNutt, Francis A., *Bartholomew De Las Casas*, New York, 1909.
- McLoughlin, J. Fairfax, *The Life and Times of John Kelly*, New York, 1885.
- McMaster, John B., *A History of the People of the United States*, New York, 1913, 8 vols.
- McQuade, Vincent A., *The American Catholic Attitude on Child Labor since 1891*, Washington, 1938.
- Maes, Camillus P., *The Life of Reverend Charles Nerinckx*, Cincinnati, 1880.
- Magri, Joseph, "Catholicity in Virginia During the Episcopacy of Bishop McGill (1850-1872)", *Catholic Historical Review*, II, 415-426.
- Mathieson, William L., *British Slavery and its Abolition, 1823-1838*, London, 1926.
- Maynard, Theodore, *The Reed and the Rock*, Portrait of Simon Bruté, New York, 1942.

- Meehan, Thomas F., "Mission Work among Colored Catholics", *Historical Records and Studies of the United States Catholic Historical Society*, VIII, 116-128.
- Meline, Mary M. and McSweeney, Edward F. X., *The Story of the Mountain*, Mount St. Mary's College and Seminary, Emmitsburg, Md., 1911, 2 vols.
- Moody, V. Alton, *Slavery on Louisiana Sugar Plantations*, Reprinted from the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, April, 1923.
- Moon, Parker T., "Catholic Social Action", *Catholic Builders of the Nation*, II, 209-228, Boston, 1923.
- Mourret, Fernand, *History of the Catholic Church*, Translated by Newton Thompson, St. Louis, 1931, 5 vols.
- Murphy, Miriam T., "Catholic Missionary Work among the Colored People of the United States, 1776-1866", *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, XXXV, 100-136.
- Murphy, Robert J., "The Catholic Church in the U. S. During the Civil War Period", *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, XXXIX, 271-346.
- "The Negro Problem and the Catholic Church", *Catholic World*, XLIV, 721-726.
- Newman, Albert H., *A History of the Baptist Churches in the United States*, New York, 1894.
- Newton, Lewis W., "Creoles and Anglo-Americans in Old Louisiana, A Study in Cultural Conflicts", *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly*, XIV, 31-48.
- O'Brien, Joseph L., *John England, Bishop of Charleston, the Apostle to Democracy*, New York, 1934.
- O'Daniel, Victor, *An American Apostle, The Very Reverend Matthew Anthony O'Brien, O.P.*, Washington, D. C., 1923.
- , *The Right Reverend Edward Dominick Fenwick, O.P.*, Washington, D. C., 1920.
- , *The Father of the Church in Tennessee, or the Life, Times, and Character of the Right Reverend Richard Pius Miles, O.P., the First Bishop of Nashville*, Washington, 1926.
- O'Gorman, Thomas, *History of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States*, New York, 1895.
- O'Shea, John J., *The Two Kenricks*, Philadelphia, 1904.
- Overdyke, W. D., "History of the American Party in Louisiana", *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, XV, 581-588, XVI, 84-91, 256-277, 409-426, 608-627.
- Pastor, Ludwig, *The History of the Popes, from the Close of the Middle Ages*, London, 1908, 24 vols.
- Paul-Louis, *Ancient Rome at Work*, New York, 1927.
- Peytraud, Lucien, *L'Esclavage aux Antilles Françaises avant 1789*, Paris, 1897.
- Pierson, Donald, *Negroes in Brazil*, Chicago, 1942.
- Phillips, Ulrich B., *American Negro Slavery*, New York, 1928.
- Purcell, Richard J., "David C. Broderick of California", *Studies* (Dublin), Sept., 1939, 415-431.

- , "Judge William Gaston, Georgetown University's First Student", *Georgetown Law Journal*, May, 1939, 839-883.
- , "Father John Thayer of New England and Ireland", *Studies* (Dublin), June, 1942, 171-184.
- Robertson, James H., *Louisiana Under the Rule of Spain, France, and the United States*, Cleveland, 1911, 2 vols.
- Robertson, William, *The History of the Discovery and Settlement of America*, New York, 1829.
- Rowland, Kate Mason, *The Life of Charles Carroll of Carrollton, 1737-1832. With His Correspondence and Public Papers*, New York, 1898, 2 vols.
- Rothensteiner, John, *History of the Archdiocese of St. Louis*, 1928, 2 vols.
- Rouse, M. F. (Brother Bede, C.F.X.), *A Study of the Development of Negro Education under Catholic Auspices in Maryland and the District of Columbia*, Baltimore, 1935.
- Ryan, John A., *Distributive Justice*, New York, 1942.
- Ryan, John A. and Boland, Francis J., *Catholic Principles of Politics*, New York, 1941.
- Satineau, Maurice, *Histoire de la Guadeloupe Sous l'Ancien Régime, 1635-1789*, Paris, 1928.
- Schafer, Joseph, "Who Elected Lincoln", *The American Historical Review*, Oct., 1941, 51-63.
- Scharf, J. Thomas, *History of Maryland*, Baltimore, 1879, 3 vols.
- Schaminger, H. J., *William Gaston of North Carolina Statesman and Jurist*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis at Georgetown University, 1939.
- Shea, John G., *History of the Catholic Church in the United States*, New York, 1890, 4 vols.
- , "A Pioneer of the West, Rev. Charles Nerinckx", *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, V, 486-508.
- Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr., *Orestes Brownson*, Boston, 1939.
- Schmeckebier, Laurence F., *History of the Know-Nothing Party in Maryland*, (Johns Hopkins Studies in Historical and Political Science, XVII), 1899.
- Shugg, Roger W., *Origins of Class Struggle in Louisiana*, Louisiana State University Press, 1939.
- Shuster, George N., "Shall We Ban Child Labor", *Commonweal*, April 6, 1934, 623-624.
- , "The Conflict Among Catholics", *The American Scholar*, X, No. 1, 5-16.
- Smith, Donnal V., "The Influence of the Foreign Born of the Northwest in the Election of 1860", *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XIX, 192-204.
- Smith, Ellen H., *Charles Carroll of Carrollton*, Cambridge, Mass., 1942.
- Smith, Theodore C., *Parties and Slavery*, New York, 1906.
- Southey, Robert, *History of Brazil*, London, 1822, 3 vols.
- Spalding, John L., *The Life of the Most Reverend M. J. Spalding, D.D.*, Baltimore, 1873.
- Spalding Martin J., *Sketches of the Life, Times and Character of the Rt. Rev. Benedict Joseph Flaget*, Louisville, 1852.
- Stephenson, George M., "Nativism in the Forties and Fifties with Special Reference to the Mississippi Valley", *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, IX, 184-202.

- Swaney, Charles B., *Episcopal Methodism and Slavery with Sidelights on Ecclesiastical Politics*, Boston, 1930.
- Sweet, William W., *The Story of Religions in America*, New York, 1930.
- , *Religion on the American Frontier*
- I. *The Baptists*, New York, 1931.
 - II. *The Presbyterians*, New York, 1936.
 - III. *The Congregationalists*, Chicago, 1939.
- Swisher, Carl B., *Roger B. Taney*, New York, 1936.
- Taylor, R. H., "Humanizing the Slave Code of North Carolina", *North Carolina Historical Review*, II, 323-331.
- Theobald Stephen L., "Catholic Missionary Work among the Colored People of the United States (1776-1866)", *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, XXXV, 324-344.
- Thompson, Robert E., *A History of the Presbyterian Churches in the United States*, New York, 1895.
- Trexler, Harrison A., *Slavery in Missouri* (Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, XXXII), Baltimore, 1914.
- Vaissière, Pierre De, *Saint Domingue, La Société et la Vie Créoles sous l'Ancien Régime*, 1629-1789, Paris, 1919.
- Vogel, Claude L., *The Capuchins in French Louisiana (1722-1766)*, (Studies in American Church History, Catholic University of America, VII), Washington, D. C., 1928.
- Wayland, Francis E., "Slave Breeding in America: The Stevenson-O'Connell Imbroglia of 1838", *Virginia Magazine of History*, Jan., 1942, 47-54.
- Westermann, William L., "Sklaverei", Paulys, Wissowa-Kroll, *Real-Encyclopädie Der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Supplementband VI, 894-1067, Stuttgart, 1935.
- Will, Allen S., *Life of Cardinal Gibbons*, Archbishop of Baltimore, New York, 1922, 2 vols.
- Williams, Mary W., "The Treatment of Negro Slaves in the Brazilian Empire: A Comparison with the United States of America", *Journal of Negro History*, XV, 315-336.
- Wittke, Carl, *We Who Built America*, New York, 1939.
- Woodson, Carter G., *The Education of the Negro Prior to 1861*, New York, 1915.
- , *History of the Negro Church*, Washington, 1921.
- , "The Negroes of Cincinnati Prior to the Civil War", *Journal of Negro History*, I, 1-22.
- Wright, Benjamin F., *American Interpretations of the Natural Law*, Cambridge, Mass., 1931.
- Wyndham, Hugh A., *The Atlantic and Slavery*, London, 1935 (Problems of Imperial Trusteeship, II).
- Zwierlein, Frederick J., *The Life and Times of Bishop McQuaid*, Rochester, 1925, 3 vols.

INDEX

- Abolitionism, rise of, 62; Pastoral of 1843 on, 64; Bishop England's dislike of, 69; *United States Catholic Miscellany* on, 72; *Catholic Advocate* on, 74-84; *Catholic Telegraph* on, 76; *Boston Pilot* on, 77-79; opposition of Catholics, 90, 155; effect upon southern Catholics, 142; *Catholic Mirror* on, 149, 155; opposition of hierarchy, 156
- Abolitionists, effect upon instruction of slaves, 54; enmity to Catholicism, 72, 73; *Advocate*, on, 74-75
- Address to the Cincinnati Irish Repeal Association*, 82
- Aime, Valcour, 41
- American Colonization Society, 53
- American Party, 91
- Anglican Church, 26
- Anti-Catholic sentiment, 59, 63, 87, 92-93
- Appeal*, of Daniel O'Connell and Theobald Mathew to Irish in America, 81-82, 83
- Aquinas, Thomas, 13-14
- Asiento, 17
- Attakapas country, 45
- Badin, Stephen, 55
- Balmes, Jaime, 128
- Baltimore, Lord, quoted, 26-27
- Baltimore, Second Provincial Council of, 53; provincial councils of, 63; Plenary Council of, 63; attitude of Councils on Slavery, 63-64; Council of 1840, 63; Council of 1843, 64; Plenary Council of 1852, 64, 89-90; Second Plenary Council of, 158
- Baptist Church, 86
- Bardstown, Ky., 74, 75
- Barron, Edward, 53
- Baudier, Roger, 45
- Becraft, Maria, 57
- Bedini, Gaetano, 92-93
- Bishop of London, and baptism of slaves, 25-26
- Bishops, and slavery, 62-64; efforts to keep Catholic Church free from slavery controversy, 85, 89-90
- Brassac, Hercule, quoted, 43, 56
- Brazil, Indian slavery, 18; Negro slavery, 17, 18-19, 22-24, 27
- Broderick, David, 116, 152
- Brown, John, 94
- Brownson, Orestes, on the Catholic attitude towards Utopianism, 97; opposition to English interference, 107; dislike of slavery, 111; debate with Archbishop Hughes, 118-122; support of emancipation, 129-130, 152
- Butler, Thaddeus, 130
- Calhoun, John C., 86
- Calverts, 26
- Cameron, Simon, 123
- Capuchins, ownership of slaves in Louisiana, 33; reports on religious conditions among planters and slaves, 34-35
- Carey, Henry J., 115-116, 152
- Carey, Mathew, 53, 115
- Carmelite convent, 46
- Carondelet Code, 32
- Carroll, Charles, 53, 132-133, 141
- Carroll, John, Report to Propaganda, 30; dislike of slave system, 131-132; emancipation of slaves, 141
- Catholic Advocate*, 74, attitude towards abolitionists, 74-75, opposition to English interference, 75; on colonization, 75; on slavery, 75; on abolitionist agitation by churches, 75-76; advertisements for runaway slaves, 76
- Catholics, ownership and management of slaves in the U. S., 40-42; religious instruction of slaves, 42-45; attitude towards Child Labor amendment and Department of Education, 74; and abolitionism, 85, 90, 109; and European radicalism, 91-92, 93; immigrant Catholics and abolitionism, 102-103, dislike of England, 106-107; Northern Catholics and slavery, 113-115; and state rights, 113-114; anti-slavery sentiment, 115-117; divided opinion during war years, 118; opposition to emancipation, 123-126; support of emancipation, 126-130; southern Catholics and slavery, 131, 138-143, 151; sectional divergence, 152, regarded as pro-slavery, 157-158
- Catholic Church, tradition on slavery, 11, 90, attitude towards serfdom, 14; and slavery of Indians, 16, 19; and Negro slavery in colonies, 19-

- 21; and African slave trade, 20-21; religious privileges of slaves in Latin colonies, 24; in English America, 25-26, teaching on marriage of slaves, 48; doctrine on slavery, 60-61; difficulties in the U. S., 62; attitude towards political issues, 63; position on slavery in the U. S., 66; tradition of church theologians, 67; F. P. Kenrick on traditional policy of, 70-72; efforts to keep free of sectional issues, 85, 89-90; European opposition to, 90; theory of social reform, 97; teaching on property rights, 98; John Hughes on traditional policy of, 110-111; condemnation of slave trade, 113; in the South, 131, 137; attitude towards slavery controversy, 152; unofficial position of, 155, 158-159
- Catholicism, hostility to, in the United States, 62; enemies among abolitionists, 72, 73; hostility to, in Massachusetts, 78; spokesmen for, 153; American Catholicism, 160-161
- Catholic Herald and Visitor*, on slavery in territories, 111-112
- Catholic Mirror*, on private interpretation of the Scriptures, 101; on British interference with American ships, 106-107; support of Confederacy, 149; opposition to emancipation, 149-151, 155
- Catholic Negroes, total in South, 39
- Catholic population, in the South, 38-39
- Catholic press, discussion on slavery, 72; influence of Daniel O'Connell, 80; on conservatism of Catholic Church, 94-96; on reformers, 99-101; effect of Civil War upon, 148-149, 155-156; in pre-war period, 161
- Catholic Standard*, 145
- Catholic Telegraph, critical of abolitionism, 76; on antislavery parties, 102; loyalty to Union, 118; support of emancipation, 127-130; 149
- Channing, William E., 98
- Charles V, 17
- Charleston Courier*, 65
- Charleston, South Carolina, schools for free Negroes, 58; 147
- Charlestown, Mass., 62
- Chicago, 130
- Child Labor Amendment, 74, 114
- Christianity, and classical slavery, 12; effect on slavery, 68
- Church facilities, in South, 43-44
- Church Fathers, 11, 12, 13, 67
- Church registers, records of baptisms and marriages, 54
- Cincinnati, nativist riots, 93; message to the clergy and laity of, 94
- Citizen*, 105
- Civil War, 55
- Clergy, secular clergy and slavery, 21; slaveholding in the U. S., 45-52; missionary work among slaves, 54-56; attitude towards slavery, 161
- Cochin, Augustin, and antislavery petitions, 107, author of *L'Abolition de L'Esclavage*, 108, 118
- Code Noir, 22, 23; in Louisiana, 32; adoption in state of Louisiana, 37
- Colonization Society, 53, 81, 133
- Congregation of the Holy Family, 58
- Converts among slaves, 59-60
- Creoles, 40-45, 92
- Dew, Thomas, 120
- Democratic Party, allegiance of Irish-Americans, 84; Catholic allegiance to, 102, 114, 118, 154, 155
- District of Columbia, classes for free Negroes, 57
- Dominicans, 15, 16, 47
- Donohoe, Patrick, editor of *Pilot*, 78; opposition to abolitionism, 78-79; gradual emancipation, 80; on reformers, 99; loyalty to Union, 118
- Douglas, Stephen A., 116
- Doupanloup, Felix R. P., 108
- Du Bourg, William, 36, 57
- East Boston, 130
- Emancipation Proclamation, 118; Catholic opposition, 123-126; Catholic support of, 126-130; attitude of southern Catholics, 144-145; opposition of *Catholic Mirror*, 149-151; southern support, 151
- Emmitsburg, Maryland, 119
- England, John, mission facilities in Carolinas, 44; interest in slaves, 56; school for free Negroes, 58; charge of abolitionism, 58; interest in Americanization of immigrants, 65; accused of abolitionism, 65-66; legate to Haiti, 5; school for Negro Children, 65; *Letters on Domestic Slavery*, 66-70; death of, 66, 70; on Nat Tyler's revolt, 72; conflict with English government, 73; and Daniel O'Connell, 83; 120; per-

- sonal dislike of slave system, 132, 138, 139, 147, 156, 157
 Episcopal Church, 86-87, 89
 European Catholics and slavery, 107-109
 Federal Department of Education, 74
 Fenwick, Benedict Joseph, 76
 Florissant, Missouri, novitiate farm, 49-50; 52
 Forsyth, John, 66
Freeman's Journal, rebuke of Daniel O'Connell, 84-85; on Garrisonians, 85; on conservatism of Catholic Church, 95-96; opposition to British influence in antislavery movement, 103; support of Peace Democrats, 118; opposition to Emancipation Proclamation, 124-125, 127, 149, 155
 Franciscans, 16
 Free Negroes, charitable and missionary work among, 57-58
 French colonies, Indian slavery, 17-18; Negro slavery, 17-18, 19, 22-24, 27; Louisiana slave custom, 31-33
 Fugitive slave disorders, 94
 Fugitive slave laws, 113; 117; 140
 Fuller, Richard, 88
 Ganges, Council of, 70
 Garrisonians, *Freeman's Journal* on, 85; rejection by Catholics, 90
 Garrisonian movement, in Mass., 78; Catholic attitude towards, 85; opposition among churchmen, 88
 Gaston, William, 134-137, 142, 144, 158
 Gayarré, Charles, 40
 German Catholics, membership in Democratic Party, 102; opposition to abolitionism, 154
 Gibbons, James, 160
 Gregory XVI, Apostolic Letter against slave trade, 21, 63, 64; accused of abolitionism, 66; on slave trade in U. S., 67
 Gruber, Jacob, 133
Guardian, on conservatism of Catholic position, 139
 Hagerstown, Maryland, 133
 Hammon, Governor, 120
 Hierarchy in U. S., 153-154, 155, 156-157, 161
 Hopkins, John Henry, 127
 Hughes, John, and Daniel O'Connell, 83-84; on private judgment, 98; on Catholicism and slavery, 110-111; debate with Brownson, 118-122; mission to Europe, 122; concern for Irish loyalty, 122-123; dislike of abolitionism, 122, 147, 156, 147
 Hunter, George, 28
 Indian slavery, in Spanish colonies, 15-16; in French colonies, 17-18; in Brazil, 18
 Irish, and abolitionism, 80; as enemies of colored race, 82; dislike of Britain, 84; opposition to abolitionism, 84-85; accused of proslavery bias, 93; defense by John Kelly, 96; jealousy of Negro worker, 103; on English influence in antislavery movement, 103-106; opposition to emancipation, 124-125, 154, 159-160
 Irish-Americans, 82-83
Irish News, 106
 Jan, Père, 45
 Jenkins, Courtney, 149, 150
 Jesuit Fathers, manors in provincial Maryland, 27; attitude to slavery in Maryland, 28-30; work among slaves of Catholics, 29; farms, 31; ownership of slaves in Louisiana, 33; work among slaves in Louisiana, 33; sale of slaves, 47; treatment of slaves on farms, 49-50; slave labor unprofitable, 51-52; Georgetown Jesuits, 57
 Jesuit pastor, 48
 Joubert, Jacques Hector Nicholas, 57
 Kansas, 94, 112
 Kansas-Nebraska Act, 116
 Kelly, John, 53, 96
 Kenrick, Francis P., on Liberia, 53; author of *Theologia Moralis*, 70; on secession, 146, 156
 Kenrick, Peter R., 146
 Kentucky, slave system, 42; Catholic opposition to abolitionism, 73-74; attitude of Catholics towards slave system, 76
 Know-Nothings, 92, 93, 157
 Kossuth, Louis, 90-91
 Lambert, John, 115
 Las Casas, Bartolomeo, 15, 16
 Latin colonies, negro slavery in, 22-24
 Leo X, 16
 Leo XIII, 159
Letters on Domestic Slavery, by John England, 66-70, 120, 139, 156
 Liberia, missions, 53
 Lincoln, Abraham, 122, 123, 149

- Loretto Community, 55-56
 Louisiana, introduction of Negro slaves, 31; French and Spanish slave customs, 31-33; religious demoralization, 36-37; Latin legal tradition, 37-38; Negro population, 39; religious conditions in national period, 44-45; schools for free Negroes, 57-58; Native American Party, 91
 Lutheran Church, 86
 Lynch, Patrick N., 147
 Manumission of slaves, by religious bodies in the U. S., 52-53; attitude of southern Catholics, 141-142
 Martin, Augustus, 44
 Maryland, conversion of slaves, 26; charges against Catholics, 29; problems of clergy in colonial Maryland, 30; Negro population, 39; clerical opinion on secession, 146
 Maryland planters, and religion of slaves, 27-28; treatment of slaves, 30-31
 Massachusetts, Anti-Slavery Society, *Pilot* on, 100
 Mathew, Theobald, antislavery petition, 81-82
 McMaster, James, 118, 124, 125, 127, 128, 149
 Meagher, Francis Thomas, on abolitionism, 105-106
 Methodist Church, split over slavery, 86
Metropolitan Record, opposition to British influence in antislavery movement, 103, 104-105; support of Peace Democrats, 118; opposition to Emancipation Proclamation, 124-125; 127; 150; 155
 Mexican War, 92
 Miles, Richard, 44
 Missionaries, in Spanish colonies, 15; Jesuit missionaries in Maryland, 27; missionaries in Colonial Louisiana, 33-35; in Mississippi Valley, 36; in prewar South, 39, 42-43, 54-60, 160
 Missouri, branch of Society of Jesus, 46; clerical opinion of secession, 146
 Mitchel, John, proslavery argument, 105-106
 Mobberly, Brother Joseph, 28-29, 31, 48, 50, 51
 Montalembert, Comte de, 107
 Montesinos, Antonio, 15
 Mucius, 91
 Mullaly, John, 118, 124-125, 126, 128, 152
 Nashville, 146
 Nashville, Tennessee, 44
 Natchitoches, Louisiana, 44
 National Commission for Indians and Negroes, 160
 Native American Party, 92
 Negro schools, 57-58, 65
 Negro slavery in Brazil, 17, 18-19, 22-24, 27; in English America, 25-27; in French West Indies, 17-18, 19, 22-24; in Spanish colonies, 16-17, 19, 22-24, 27
 Negroes, Catholic missionary work among, 33-37, 42-43, 54-60, 160; in the pre-war South, 39; pre-war attitude of Catholics to, 159-160
 Nerinckx, Charles, 55, 56
 New Haven, proposed Negro college, 72, 77
 New Orleans, 45, 58
 New York, emancipation act of 1817, 80; school controversy, 92
 North Carolina, slave laws and judicial decisions, 136-137
 Oblate Sisters of Providence, 56, 57
 O'Connor, Charles, 117-118, 152
 O'Connell, Daniel, support of anti-slavery movement, 80-82; petition to Irish in America, 81-82; rebuked by John Hughes, 83-84; *Address to the Cincinnati Irish Repeal Association*, 82, 84; and emancipation in West Indies, 107; and Hughes, 111
 Odin, John, quoted, 36-37, 56
Old Testament, on slavery, 67
 Orlando, 16-17
 Oregon boundary dispute, 92
 Papal pronouncements, on slavery of Indians, 15-16; on African slave trade, 20-21
 Parker, Theodore, 98, 99
 Paul III, 16
 Penalver y Cardenas, Bishop, 35
 Philadelphia, 92
Pilot, founded by Bishop Fenwick, 76; attitude towards abolitionist crusade, 77-78; on Negro college 77; on O'Connell-Mathew *Appeal*, 83; on naturalization, 92; on "Black Republicans," 95; on Boston reform group, 99; opposition to

- British influence in antislavery movement, 103; support of Fugitive Slave laws, 115; loyalty to Union, 118; opposition to Emancipation Proclamation, 125-126
- Pindar, Denis, 53
- Pittsburgh Catholic*, condemnation of slavery, 111; loyalty to Union, 118
- Pius II, 16
- Pius IX, on slave trade, 108
- Plenary Council of Baltimore, 1852, 64, 89-90; 1866, 153, 158
- Port Tobacco, Maryland, 46
- Portugal, African slave trade, 14-15; slave code, 19
- Presbyterian Church, 75, 86
- Pro-slavery Argument*, 120
- Protestant, distrust of Catholics in Maryland, 29; slave holding by, 30; immigration to Louisiana, 45; attitude of Protestant planters to Catholic missionaries, 59; missionary activity among slaves, 59; pro-slavery argument, 68; nativism, 92; similarity between Catholic and Protestant slaveholders, 152
- Protestant churches, division over slavery question, 86-89, 154, 158
- Protestant Crusade, 92, 154
- Purcell, Edward, 118; views on emancipation, 127-129, 149, 152
- Purcell, John B., 127
- Quinlan, John, 146-147
- Raho, Father, 56
- Raphael, Father, quoted, 34-35
- Red Republicanism, 91-92
- Reform movement in the U. S., 97
- Religious instruction of slaves, 54-55
- Religious orders, and Negro slavery in Latin colonies, 21-22; slaveholding in Louisiana territory, 33; slaveholding in the United States, 46-52; manumissions of slaves in the U. S., 52-53
- Religious press, and slavery, 72; slavery an evil, 111-112; in pre-war U. S., 161
- Repeal societies, 80, 82-83
- Roquette, Adrian, quoted, 91-92
- St. Louis, 146
- St. Martin's Church, 45
- St. Paul, 64
- Scholasticism, teaching on slavery, 13
- Scriptures, and proslavery argument, 88
- Serfdom, 14
- Seward, William H., 122
- Shields, James, on slavery, 112, 116-117
- Slave trade, attitude of Church, 20-21; in Spanish colonies, 17; in Louisiana, 31; papal pronouncement on, 67
- Smith, Brother Matthew, 51
- Spain, traffic in Negro slaves, 14-15; smuggling of Negro slaves, 17; slave code, 19; Louisiana slave customs, 31, 32-33
- Spalding, Martin J., 128
- Spanish crown, and Indian slavery, 15-16
- Spanish Indies, colonists and Indian slavery, 15-16; Negro slavery, 16-17, 19, 22-24, 27
- State rights, and Catholic opinion, 113, 155
- State v. Manuel, 144
- State v. Will, 135-136
- Stephens, Alexander, quoted, 157
- Sulpician Fathers, 56, 57
- Tablet*, 118
- Taney, Roger B., 133-134, 141-142, 144
- Territories, slavery in, 92, 113
- Thayer, John, 131
- Theologia Moralis*, 70, 156
- Tyler, Nat, 72
- United States Catholic Miscellany*, establishment of, 65; against abolitionism, 72; on Negro college at New Haven, 72; on state rights, 73; opposition to English interference in U. S., 73, 75; support of Confederacy, 145
- Urban VIII, 20
- Ursuline nuns, work among slaves, 33; convent in Charlestown, Mass., 62
- Van Quickenborne, Charles, 46, 47
- Verhaegen, Father, 52
- Verot, Augustine, sermon on slavery, 137-138; 148
- Vieyera, Antonio, 19
- Visitation Nuns, 57
- Walsh, Robert, 53; on Liberia, 53; on slavery, 112
- Wayland, Francis, moderate position on slavery, 87
- Webb, Benjamin J., 74
- Whelan, Bishop, quoted, 98
- Whitfield, Archbishop, and Negro education, 56

VITA

MADELEINE HOOKE RICE was born in New York City on July 2, 1903. She was graduated from Barnard College in 1925 with a Bachelor of Arts degree and received the degree of Master of Arts from Columbia University in 1939 and the degree of Doctor of Philosophy from the same institution in 1943. She is a member of Phi Beta Kappa.

During her graduate work at Columbia she attended a seminar on the "Westward Movement in the United States, 1783-1860" conducted by Professor Samuel McKee Jr., and a seminar on "Studies in American History, 1830-1860" conducted by Professor Henry Steele Commager.

She is now an instructor in History at the Brothers College of Drew University.

